

059368

JPRS 82572

3 January 1983

USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 15, October 1982

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

19991008 001

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

4
164
A08

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

[illegible]

3 January 1983

USSR REPORT TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 15, October 1982

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

CONTENTS

Great October Revolution and the Founding of the USSR.....	1
L. I. Brezhnev's Speech in Baku.....	15
From the Talk Between L. I. Brezhnev and the Leaders of the Azerbaijan SSR.....	22
L. I. Brezhnev's Answer to the Appeal of Venezuelan Political and Social Public Figures.....	26
K. Marx's 'Das Kapital' in the Russian Language (L. Mis'kevich, A. Chepurenko).....	29
Darwin's Revolution in Biology and Its Philosophical Aspects (N. Iribadzhakov).....	43
A Quarter-Century of the Space Age (A. Yelisseyev).....	56
The Power of Initiative (A. Drygin).....	69
Replenishment of the Work Force (Yu. Demin).....	83
One One-Thousandth of the Country (V. Shustikov).....	97
Socialist Democracy, State System, and Local Government.....	110

Fifteen Years of Struggle for Democracy and Progressive Transformations in the PDRY (Ali Naser Mukhammed).....	124
Philosophical Analysis of Economic Consciousness (L. Ponomarev).....	133
The Victorious Advance of Socialism (A. Uspenskiy, P. Khromov).....	138
From the History of National Intellectual Culture (V. Shinkaruk).....	144
Short Book Reviews (V. Novikov, V. Lavrin, N. Ruban).....	151

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 15
October 1982

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : MOSCOW

Date of Publication : October 1982

Signed to press : 11 October 1982

Copies : 795,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",
"Kommunist", 1982

GREAT OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND THE FOUNDING OF THE USSR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 3-14

[Text] During the year when the Soviet Union is celebrating the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR it is particularly pertinent to recall that the first victorious socialist revolution, having opened the way to the elimination of the exploitation of man by man, also made possible the implementation of the prediction contained in the "Communist Party Manifesto:" "Hostile attitudes among nations will be eliminated together with class antagonism within the individual nations."

Under the conditions of Russia the tasks of social and national liberation were closely interwoven. In a primarily peasant multinational country, the relatively weak proletariat could not rely on seizing, not to mention retaining, the political power without an alliance with the peasantry and the oppressed nations. Therefore, the circumstances themselves faced the bolshevik party with the historical task of combining the socialist struggle waged by the proletariat with that of the peasantry and the national liberation movement.

Incidentally, most leaders and theoreticians in the European social democratic movement did not set themselves such a task even theoretically, convinced that should such an alliance be established in Russia, it would break down immediately following the overthrow of czarism: having become owners as a result of the division of the land, peasants with no or little land would become the opponents of the proletariat economically, and the exercise of the right of nations to self-determination would allegedly mean the splintering of the country and the division of the proletariat according to national characteristics, to the detriment of class unity needed in the struggle against the capitalist system. In the past such bourgeois-democratic measures usually led to strengthening the rule of the bourgeoisie and it was for this reason that the bolsheviks were advised not to "force" history but to allow the bourgeoisie to carry out its historical purpose. It was recommended to the bolsheviks not to encroach on the hegemony of the bourgeoisie in resolving bourgeois-democratic problems.

However, the moment they appeared such recommendations were clearly obsolete. As early as the eve of the 1905-1907 Russian Revolution, V. I. Lenin formulated the idea of the hegemony of the proletariat in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, proving that its corresponding slogans which in the past had contributed to strengthening the bourgeois order could, under the new

circumstances, be used by the revolutionary proletariat to serve its own interests. The experience in revolutionary struggle, acquired in the course of the two Russian bourgeois democratic revolutions, fully confirmed the accuracy of Lenin's conclusion, thus providing the bolshevik party with the necessary tools for social accomplishments and inaugurating a new age in social development.

It is the consideration of these circumstances that enables us to bring to light the true significance of the Leninist program on the national problem. In defending the basic Marxist stipulations on the need to subordinate the national problem to the class and international interests of the proletariat, Lenin pointed out that the communists are working for the unity of and a merger among workers of all nations. At the same time, he emphasized that the revolutionary proletariat, as the most consistent supporter of the democratic solution of the national problem, favors total equality among nations and defends their right to self-determination.

V. I. Lenin predicted that the victory of the socialist revolution will not immediately resolve the national problem but will merely create real conditions to this effect. "In the way that mankind can eliminate classes only through the transitional period of the dictatorship of the oppressed class," he wrote at the beginning of 1916, "the inevitable merger of human nations can take place only through the transitional period of the full liberation of all oppressed nations, i.e., through their freedom to separate" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 27, p 256).

After the October Revolution, Lenin decisively opposed the view that the elimination of national oppression would automatically resolve the national problem and make unnecessary the idea of the right of nations to self-determination. In 1919, while the new party program was being discussed, Lenin rejected suggestions calling for the self-determination of the working people, which in fact annulled the concept of national self-determination. "Our program," he wrote, "should not speak of the self-determination of the working people.... Each nation must be given the right to self-determination, and it is this that contributes to the self-determination of the working people" (op. cit., vol 38, p 161).

V. I. Lenin pointed out the fact that chauvinistic and nationalistic prejudices, which had been nurtured by the age-old experience in national oppression, national hostility and discord, could not be eliminated the second day after the October Revolution. It was only the new experience developed under the conditions of a soviet system that could make the masses realize the necessity and possibility of establishing essentially new relations among nations.

One of the first actions of the victorious October Revolution was the liberation of the oppressed nations. On 2 (15) November 1917 the Council of People's Commissars adopted the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia, which proclaimed a break with the policy of national oppression. The Soviet government recognized the independence of the Ukraine, Finland and

other national states on the territory of the former Russian empire. It annulled the enslaving treaties concluded between the czarist government and colonial and dependent countries.

These measures did not indicate in the least the bolshevik intention of breaking down the Russian state, as the chauvinists accused them. The point was that the establishment of a democracy represented by the soviets, the Decree on Peace, the transfer of landed estates to the peasants, and the establishment of worker control over industry, followed by the nationalization of capitalist enterprises, were all steps consistent with the profound expectations of the working people of all nations. They laid objective foundations for an incomparably stronger comity among nations. The exercise of the right of nations to self-determination within the context of these sociopolitical measures dealt an extremely strong blow to great-power chauvinism and bourgeois nationalism as well.

Prior to the October Revolution, the broad masses were unaware of the fact that national interests were dominated by class interests. The great-power chauvinists and bourgeois nationalists, both interested in the suppression of the class struggle, quite successfully used appeals for "national unity," which met with a response among a significant percentage of the population, in order to broaden their influence. Having abolished national oppression, the October Revolution gave priority to sociopolitical problems, i.e., it shifted the struggle to a plane entirely unsuited to nationalists of all hues. After the October Revolution the bourgeois-landowning parties could no longer limit themselves to national topics but were forced to define their attitude toward the Soviet system and its radical sociopolitical measures.

The bolsheviks consistently linked the solution of the national problem to profound economic and social change. The elimination of national oppression abolished the main source of friction among nations, whereas the actions of the Soviet system helped the toiling people of all nationalities to realize the profoundly common nature of their interests. As a result, the bourgeois nationalists in most of the country found themselves isolated. Wherever the ties between the national liberation movement and the workers were weak (the Ukraine, the Transcaucasus, Moldavia), the bourgeois nationalists, who had temporarily come to power, were able to promote self-determination on a bourgeois basis. However, even there they were unable to restrain the class struggle or to draw the attention of the working people away from the tasks of social liberation. As the bolsheviks predicted, the full liberation of the nations began to work against the bourgeois nationalists. The very first actions committed by the bourgeois nationalists against the Soviet system resulted in a break between them and the popular masses, a break which intensified and, in the final account, became fatal in terms of bourgeois-nationalistic practices.

By converting to anti-Soviet positions, the bourgeois nationalists found themselves in the same camp as their enemies of yesterday. Whereas the Russian monarchists rallied the counterrevolutionary forces under the slogan of "single and indivisible Russ," the bourgeois nationalists fiercely fought the Soviet system under the flag of separatism. Came the hour of truth.

The rich classes, having rejected chauvinistic and nationalistic trinkets, rallied in their struggle against the toiling masses of all nationalities, waging a struggle which exposed the class nature of the deployment of socio-political forces and led the toiling masses of different nationalities to realize the vital need for unity within their ranks regardless of national differences.

It was thus that the liberation of the oppressed nations became the starting point in the development of their new type of unification under way.

The first manifestations of this turn were the defeat of the bourgeois nationalists in the Ukraine and Moldavia, and the drastic weakening of their positions in the Transcaucasus. The antipeople's Rada regime was abolished in the Ukraine and a soviet system was established throughout the republic by the end of February 1918. The soviet system won out in Moldavia at the beginning of 1918 and in the Northern Caucasus in the spring, and it was only the bayonets of the German-Turkish and, subsequently, British interventionists that were able to rescue for a while the bourgeois nationalists in the Transcaucasus from the strengthened struggle for a soviet system. The victory of the soviet system in the national outlying areas created a strong class and political comity among Soviet republics, which was of immeasurably greater importance in terms of the interests of the working people compared with still-remaining national boundaries. Economic cooperation developed from the very first days of the October Revolution, for the economic problems facing the Soviet republics could be resolved only through joint efforts. During the difficult period of the civil war the boundaries among Soviet republics disappeared under the lines marking the war fronts which had divided the territory of the former Russian empire into two camps: revolutionary and counterrevolutionary. The military cooperation among Soviet republics was born and tempered in the flames of the fierce battles against foreign interventionists and White armies.

Treaties were concluded among the republics on the basis of the development of their economic and military cooperation. A military-economic alliance among the Soviet republics of Russia, the Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania and Belorussia was concluded on 1 June 1919. Union treaties were concluded between the RSFSR and the Ukrainian, Azerbaijani, Belorussian, Georgian and Armenian SSRs and the Khorezma and Bukhara People's Soviet Republics in 1920-1921.

During the final stage of the civil war the Soviet republics united in pursuing a single foreign policy course with a view to counteracting the subversive actions of the anti-Soviet front of the imperialist powers. In January 1922 the representatives of the Soviet republics signed a protocol granting the RSFSR the right to defend their interests at the Genoa conference.

Lenin's brilliant prediction that life itself would lead the Soviet republics to unification became reality.

However, it would be simplistic to assume that this process developed exceptionally as a result of objective circumstances. Even when the conditions of

the struggle urgently required the conversion to internationalist positions, age-old chauvinistic and nationalistic prejudices considerably hindered such a transition.

The historical merit of the communist party was that, strengthening its policy of providing objective opportunities for the voluntary unification among nations, it carried out a tremendous amount of work for their implementation. The organization of the party itself, which had preserved its organizational unity even after the establishment of the individual republics, a policy which was imbued with proletarian internationalism and based on the internationalist principle of organization, guaranteed the success of this work. The proletarian internationalism of the communists was the strongest antidote to the chauvinistic and nationalistic ideas and feelings. Everywhere the communist party acted as the unifying and mobilizing force of the unification movement among the Soviet peoples.

The sinister prophecies of White Guard chauvinists, who had predicted the breakdown of the Russian state, were refuted by the turn taken toward the unification among Soviet republics. The czarist Russian empire--the jail of the peoples--was swept away and replaced by a multinational governmental unification unprecedented in the history of mankind. The communist party charted a course of voluntary unification of equal and sovereign Soviet republics within a single union state.

No single historically progressive class in the past could even conceive of the possible implementation of such principles. However, the task, which looked like pure utopia in a society torn by class antagonisms, became entirely realistic with the advent to power of the working class united with the peasantry. The class comity of proletarians of all nationalities is alien to the rivalry or any kind of imperialist type of considerations which are present in the class community of the bourgeoisie and which lead to the fact that under capitalist conditions, relations among nations include "aspirations for domination instead of for freedom and the exploitation of an increasing number of small or weak nations by a small handful of the richest or strongest nations" (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 27, p 422). That is precisely why the working class, which purges inequality and domination from relations among nations, can achieve their voluntary unification.

Let us note the tremendous importance of the alliance between the working class and the peasantry in the unification movement of the nations. In the national areas within Russia the peasants, traditionally quite receptive to chauvinistic and nationalistic feelings, remained in the overwhelming majority. The establishment of a worker-peasant system, the elimination of landed estate ownership, giving the peasants land, and laying solid foundations for the alliance between the working class and the peasantry predetermined the subsequent liberation of the peasants from bourgeois influence, including their chauvinistic or nationalistic views. The very experience in the struggle waged for a people's system and for land helped the broad peasant masses to realize the fatal nature of chauvinism and nationalism, which had become part of the counterrevolutionary arsenal, and to become aware of the vital need for solidarity among working people.

The material prerequisites leading to the creation of a single union state were created as a result of the October Revolution and a 5-year period of economic and sociopolitical development. The establishment of a worker-peasant system and socialist ownership of productive capital predetermined the formation of identical national economic and social structures and state management and legislative systems. All of this considerably facilitated the unification of the Soviet republics.

The creation of a single union state became a problem of practical policy in 1922. The fact that this question was raised almost simultaneously by all the Soviet republics indicated that conditions for unification had matured. A major step on the way to their unification was the 12 March 1922 signing of a treaty on the creation of the Transcaucasian Federation at a conference of representatives of the central executive committees of the soviets of the Azerbaijani, Armenian and Georgian SSRs. On 22 August 1922 the RKP(b) Central Committee set up a commission in charge of drafting the most expedient means for the unification of all Soviet republics.

The exceptionally favorable development of the unification process, however, included the danger of anticipation, of simplifying the problem. Thus, the commission formulated the "autonomizing" plan, which called for the unification of all republics within the RSFSR on the basis of autonomy and granting the RSFSR the competence of supreme power authority. This plan reflected the views of many party and soviet workers, central and local, who based their conclusions on the generally successful experience in national-state construction in the Russian Federation, which had made possible the elimination of national oppression and ensured the equality and cooperation among nations.

However, it was known that the nations and nationalities within the RSFSR had not raised the question of their separation, for which reason the principle of autonomy did not affect their interests. The unification of republics which had already developed as independent countries on the basis of autonomy might have appeared as limiting their sovereign rights.

Lenin, who ascribed tremendous importance to the unification of the Soviet republics, firmly condemned the separatist trends of the national deviationists, who pitted narrowly understood national interests against the common international interests of the commonwealth of Soviet socialist republics. At the same time, he considered as essentially inadmissible even the slightest violation of the rights and interests of nations and nationalities. Lenin opposed the "autonomizing" plan and formulated the idea of the creation of a federated state of a new type, based on the voluntary union of independent worker and peasant republics within the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Unlike the "autonomization" plan, Lenin's suggestions called for the preservation of the equality of all republics including the RSFSR. As Lenin wrote, we, the RSFSR, "consider ourselves the equal of the Ukrainian SSR and others and, together with them, join a new union, a new federation" (op. cit., vol 45, p 211). He insisted on the fact that the unification did not affect in the least the independence of the republics but erected "another floor, a federation of equal republics" (ibid., p 212). The draft resolution

on relations between the RSFSR and the other Soviet republics, based on Lenin's suggestions, was approved by the RKP(b) Central Committee plenum.

The nationwide discussion of the project took place in an atmosphere of exceptional unanimity and enthusiasm. After all the republics had approved the idea of the creation of the USSR, the declaration and treaty of its founding were adopted at the First All-Union Congress of Soviets, on 30 December 1922.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was a new form, a state of proletarian dictatorship. Considering the solution of class problems a cornerstone, Marxism believed that a single democratic republic would create optimal conditions for the fulfillment of the functions of proletarian dictatorship. The Marxists disapproved of a federal state, in the belief that it would bring unnecessary decentralization which would hinder the consistent implementation of the principle of democratic centralism in the organization of the governmental system.

Under the specific historical circumstances, however, the victorious working class inherited from the old world not only class but national distinctions. As a result, having seized the power, it immediately detected the inadequacy of a state organization which took exclusively class factors into consideration and the most urgent need for the creation of governmental structures which would regulate national relations as well. This substantially influences the nature of a state. The establishment of a single democratic republic in a multinational country would have essentially violated democracy, for in such a republic there would be no institutions representing the specific interests of the individual nations and nationalities. It was no accident that, considering the state-legal forms of national self-determination, Lenin copied the following excerpt: "Marx: I believed the separation of Ireland impossible. I now consider it inevitable, if even were it subsequently to become a federation" (V. I. Lenin, "Konspekt 'Perepiski K. Marksa i F. Engel'sa 1844-1883 gg.'" [Summary of the Correspondence Between Marx and Engels Between 1844 and 1883], Moscow, 1968, p 417). Consideration of the possibility of establishing a federation--although Marx considered a federation a matter forced by specific circumstances--broadened the search by the Marxists for a suitable form of state system under the conditions of proletarian dictatorship. We know that in 1916 Lenin expressed the idea that its establishment would also mark the beginning of a transitional period leading to the total liberation of oppressed nations. From this viewpoint the federal form of governmental system becomes a legitimate feature of the entire transitional period rather than an exception.

V. I. Lenin displayed the greatest possible caution in drawing his conclusions as to the forms of state management. However, this is not to say that he entirely relied on spontaneous developments. Starting with the April bolshevik conference, Lenin began to speak of a "union of free republics" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 32, pp 7, 41, 142 and 286). The Declaration of the Rights of the Working and Exploited People he drafted (beginning of January 1918) includes the idea of the expediency of a federal state system. The creation of the RSFSR was the first step in its implementation. In turn,

the experience in national-state construction proved the fruitfulness of the federal type of system. In summing up this experience, the RKP(b) program, which was adopted in 1919, emphasized that "... The party submits a federal unification of countries with a soviet type of organization as one of the transitional forms on the way to the full unity (of nations--the editors)." However, it was only in the course of the establishment of the USSR that the most expedient state-legal forms of comity among nations building socialism were defined.

The conjectures of Western "Sovietologists," according to whom the federal form of the Soviet state, the principle of voluntary participation, the extensive rights of the republics, and so on, are the result of the retreat of Marxism-Leninism from its basic positions under the pressure of nationalistic processes, are entirely groundless. Unquestionably, Lenin demanded a thorough consideration of the actual condition of national relations. However, his persistent calls for systematic observance of democracy in national-state construction revealed his understanding of the ways leading to the creation of a federal state of a new type from the viewpoints of both content and form. Existing experience in revolutionary law-making by the masses and in national-state construction in the Soviet republics proved that, in a multinational state, not a unified but a federal system offered optimal conditions for the implementation of the principle of democratic centralism in the organization of state power.

The idea that in a federal state additional obstacles would appear in implementing the principle of democratic centralism was based on a study of the activities of bourgeois federal countries. Under capitalist conditions, national oppression, which triggers hostility and conflicts among nations, predetermines the domination of centrifugal trends in relations among them. Because of this the nations use their autonomy to oppose the center, while the bourgeois state is unable to ensure true equality and sovereignty of nations without risking its destruction by centrifugal trends.

On the contrary, the elimination of social and national oppression, which eliminates the objective foundations for friction among nations, increases the significance of the social comity of the working people and the developing trend toward a rapprochement among nations. As in the case of the social liberation of the working people, democracy unites society in its systematic solution of the national problem. The implementation of the principles of equality and respect for the sovereignty of nations tremendously strengthens their cooperation in a society from which national oppression has been eliminated.

The practice of national-state construction in the RSFSR proved that under the conditions of the elimination of national oppression, autonomy does not hinder the rapprochement among Soviet nations. In pointing out the need to take into consideration all accomplishments in national-state construction, Lenin nevertheless presumed that one more step was necessary by eliminating some restrictions on the rights of nations related to their autonomy.

Lenin's efforts were concentrated precisely on the solution of this problem. "We want a voluntary union of nations," he emphasized, "the type of union which would not allow any domination of one nation over another...." (op. cit., vol 40, p 43). Long before the notorious clash with the "reality of nationalism," in 1913 Lenin expressed the idea that any violation of the rights and interests of nationalities essentially hinders the implementation of centralism. "... Bureaucratic interference in purely local (oblast, national, and so on) problems," he wrote, "is one of the greatest obstacles to economic and political development in general and, in particular, one of the obstacles to centralism in serious, major and basic matters" (op. cit., vol 24, p 146). Lenin could not accept the erection of such obstacles in the building of a socialist state vitally interested in implementing the principle of democratic centralism. This could be achieved only by granting the broadest possible rights to nations and nationalities and the strict respect for their interests. The USSR was founded as a state of union among toiling classes and a union among toiling nations. That is why the organization of the governmental system stipulated both sociopolitical and national representation. The supreme legislative organs consist of two chambers: the first includes the representatives of all working people and the second the representatives of all national republics and autonomous oblasts and okrugs. Such a total representation of nations and nationalities within the state administrative system makes the state authoritative and competent in resolving sociopolitical as well as national problems, i.e., it enables it to act as an authoritative central power.

The achievements in national-state construction in the USSR are of tremendous importance to the entire world, including developed capitalist countries. The view popular among the theoreticians of the Second International to the effect that the national problem had been resolved in the Western European countries and the United States has been convincingly refuted by the current explosion of the struggle waged by national minorities in North America and Western Europe. In the overwhelming majority of countries the proletariat, assuming the power, is faced with resolving the problem of the transitional period of total liberation of oppressed nations and taking this into consideration in selecting its system of state organization.

The organic link between social and national liberation became clearly apparent in the USSR. The Declaration on the Founding of the USSR correctly emphasizes that "... The new union state will be the proper crowning of the foundations of peaceful coexistence and fraternal cooperation among nations, laid as early as October 1917...." Having eliminated national oppression and created conditions for the free development of all nations, the October Revolution broke down the barriers among nations, which hindered the mobilization of all nations in building the new socialist society. The liberation of the nations became a powerful motive force of socialist development.

The unity among Soviet peoples was strengthened in the course of industrialization, the socialist reorganization of agriculture and the cultural revolution. It was tempered in the flames of the Great Patriotic War. Today, the united family of Soviet peoples is confidently blazing a path to new peaks of social progress.

The class structure of Soviet society changed in the course of its development. Nations and national relations were transformed. Thus, following the victory of socialism in the USSR the exploiting classes disappeared. This made it possible to undertake the solution of the second part of the problem of the elimination of classes--"the elimination of disparities between workers and peasants and turning all of them into working people" (op. cit., vol 39, p 277).

The disappearance of class antagonisms led to the disappearance of national antagonisms, thus totally eliminating the objective foundation for the appearance of centrifugal trends in the comity of Soviet nations. The unity of nations and nationalities became the most important component of the moral and political unity within Soviet society, which was established following the victory of socialism.

The process of the establishment of the Soviet people as a new historical community, the main features of which are already shaped under its own socialist conditions, is completed with the entry of the Soviet Union into the age of mature socialism. "In the period of developed socialism," L. I. Brezhnev pointed out in the CPSU Central Committee accountability report to the 26th party congress, "the reorganization of social relations on the basis of the collectivistic principles inherent in the new system is completed." Respectively, the national problem entirely disappears in the aspect in which it was inherited from the society of private ownership. It is exhausted both in terms of the elimination of national oppression and the liberation of the oppressed nations as well as positively--through the essential solution of the problem of equalizing the levels of economic development of the Soviet republics, which supplemented and consolidated the actual legal equality among nations and nationalities.

This does not eliminate the national problem as such from the agenda. However, the nature of national problems and the means to resolve them have changed radically. "Under contemporary conditions," the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" stipulates, "the rapprochement among all classes and social groups within Soviet society continues, leading to the establishment of an essentially and basically classless social structure within the historical framework of mature socialism."

This change in the class factor also substantially changes the circumstances under which nations and national relations develop. Along with the rapprochement of the nations the possibilities of the republics increase as well. The USSR Constitution has strengthened the guarantees of their sovereign rights and enhanced their role in the solution of nationwide problems.

All of this reminds us of the fact that although class and national relations are interrelated, the historical destinies of classes and nations vary. Thus, the claim that a classless structure exists under developed socialist conditions is not coincident with the merger among nations. As socioethnic formations, the socialist nations will obviously not disappear within the framework of mature socialism but only within a socially homogenous society,

in which the old division of labor will be surmounted. However, even the future merger among nations will not bring about the disappearance of racial-national-ethnic differences, which are basically indestructible.

In other words, the merger among nations in the future does not presume in the least the triumph of a depressing monotony or the rejection or neglect of the cultural and spiritual wealth of nations, but means their further development in accordance with the entire racial-national-ethnic variety within Soviet society.

These are the characteristics of the development of nations and national relations which are considered in the course charted by the CPSU toward the well-being and rapprochement among nations.

Attempts to pit one of these concepts against the other are groundless. Both reflect different aspects of the same process. The rapprochement among nations takes place through the equalizing of the levels of economic and cultural development and creating similar social structures, rather than eliminating national features or linguistic and ethnic differences. Therefore, the prospects for the development of national cultures, which reflect the unique features of nations and nationalities, are infinite. That is also why the blossoming of the socialist culture of the peoples of the USSR does not hinder their rapprochement in the least. In the mature socialist society the well-being and rapprochement among nations are based on relations which not only are not conflicting but which help each other.

The conjectures of bourgeois historians, according to which the rapprochement among nations in the USSR is based on their "Russification," contain as much deliberate misrepresentation as they do class limitation, which deprive them of the ability to assume the possibility of existence of relations among nations different from those of domination and subordination. The number of people who speak Russian is increasing in the Soviet Union: from three-quarters of the population in 1970 it reached four-fifths in 1979. This, however, does not suppress the national languages in the least: between 90 and 99 percent of the population of the largest ethnic groups consider the language of their own nationality their native language.

The harmonious cooperation among Soviet nations creates the most favorable possible circumstances for raising the Soviet people in a spirit of patriotism and internationalism. Our society provides no objective grounds for pitting loyalty to the native land and the traditions of one's own nation against loyalty to the comity of Soviet peoples, or loyalty to one's nation against loyalty to the entire multinational socialist fatherland.

Let us note in this connection that only deliberate falsifiers would claim that proletarian internationalism is incompatible with national feelings and national pride. Some 70 years ago, Lenin brilliantly substantiated the fact that it is precisely the revolutionary proletariat that is displaying true loyalty to the best national traditions. Exposing the baseness of great-power chauvinistic intoxication, Lenin pitted against it the true patriotism of the working class: "We love our language and our homeland. We promote them more

than anything else so that its toiling masses (i.e., nine-tenths of its population) may rise to the level of a conscious life as democrats and socialists" (op. cit., vol 26, p 107). The class approach to national traditions is the noblest of all, for it enhances the traditions which ennoble society, the traditions for social progress and for the liberation and happiness of the entire nation. At the same time, the proletarian view of national pride places on the highest level the national values and revolutionary-socialist values which are of unquestionable international significance.

The universal-historical accomplishments of the Soviet Union are a subject of special pride. "... The Soviet people," notes the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Founding of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," "is justifiably proud of its accomplishments, of the revolutionary historical mission which our homeland is honorably implementing, marching in the leading ranks of the fighters for peace, independence, freedom and happiness of the nations."

Looking at the past, we praise the constructive toil of the people, their cultural and spiritual accomplishments, the greatness of the revolutionary struggles of the popular masses, the dedication and heroism of their leaders and the democratic and revolutionary personalities. Such an attitude toward the history and traditions of the people develops lofty patriotism which, nurturing national pride, at the same time leads to an awareness of the international nature of the noble humanistic, democratic and socialist ideals for which all national heroes have fought.

Conversely, all attempts made by the supporters of the "national" spirit to praise one prerevolutionary leader or another who adopted the positions of autocracy, reactionary nationalism, opposition to social progress, and so on, are not only objectively hostile to socialist ideology but are actually aimed at encouraging chauvinism and nationalism and dividing the nations. That is precisely why such attempts have been met and will continue to be met with a decisive rebuff, as contrary to the great objectives of our socialist society and of the patriotic and internationalist upbringing of the working people.

As Lenin foresaw, the example of the USSR and its impressive accomplishments in national construction and the unparalleled blossoming of the cultural and economic upsurge of all nations and nationalities are continuing to have a tremendous revolutionary influence on the entire world. "... The existence of and example set by the Soviet Union were a bright and pleasing phenomenon in a dark and sinister world" were the words with which J. Nehru defined, figuratively yet accurately, the beneficial influence of the community of Soviet peoples on global developments and its inspiring example to the fighters for social and national liberation of the working people and all progressive mankind.

The attempts of bourgeois researchers, journalists and propagandists to discredit the Soviet experience in national-state construction are doomed to failure. Incidentally, Western "Sovietologists," who do not stop at absurdly identifying the Soviet Union with the Russian empire and Soviet national policy with the colonialism of the imperialist countries, are violating the

wise dictum of not speaking of rope in the home of someone who has been hanged. The history of colonialism is one of the most shameful pages in the past and present of the capitalist countries. The real significance of the "civilizing" mission of the bourgeoisie in the colonies is confirmed by the following data: in 1770 gross per capita output was \$210 in Europe and \$170 in countries today known as developing, i.e., 20 percent less; the respective figures for 1870 were \$560 and \$160; in 1970 they were \$2,500 and \$340, i.e., lower by a factor of 7! In British India the average per capita income dropped by a factor of almost 3 from 1850 to 1900. Such was the monstrous price of capitalist "civilization," the true nature of which is accurately described by the concept of "colonial robbery." It was precisely the plunder of the colonial and dependent countries that was and remains the main reason for the backwardness of the young countries, which continues to increase today.

In an effort to clear capitalism from this state of affairs, the bourgeois politicians and propagandists claim that a dead-end situation is being developed as a result of the objective impossibility of stopping the increasing backwardness of developing countries. However, any reference to objective factors is a bourgeois propaganda fabrication. The experience of the Soviet Union proved in practice the possibility of eliminating the economic backwardness of nations and nationalities within an extremely short historical period. The success of the Soviet experience has a simple explanation. In the West the imperialist mother countries plundered the colonies and are continuing to plunder the developing countries. The real significance of Western "aid" may be judged by the following data: by the end of the 1970s the developed capitalist countries annually extracted \$150 billion from the developing countries. Compared with this amount, their annual economic aid of \$14-15 billion is a publicity trick rather than concern for the fate of their peoples.

Contrary to such practices, the October Revolution established basically different relations between the former mother country and the colonial outlying areas. In 1922 Lenin wrote that internationalism on the part of the oppressing nations "must consist less of observing a formal equality among nations; instead, it should consist of a compensation provided by the larger oppressing nations for the inequality which develops in life" (op. cit., vol 45, p 359). What Lenin meant by this "inequality" was the material sacrifices made by a progressive nation to eliminate the actual inequality between it and an economically backward nation.

This Leninist instruction was strictly implemented. Within the family of Soviet nations the possibility of progressive republics exploiting economically backward ones was excluded. On the contrary, in the Soviet Union the redistribution of funds flowed from the developed center to the backward periphery and it was precisely this that ensured the successful elimination of the actual inequality among nations and the equalization of the levels of their economic development. Thus, between 1922 and 1981 the volume of capital investments increased by a factor of 557 in the RSFSR compared with 1,033 in the Kazakh SSR and 1,317 in the Turkmen SSR, i.e., it increased at double the rate compared with the RSFSR. "From the very first years of the

Soviet system," L. I. Brezhnev has emphasized, "our economic and social policy was structured in such a way as to enable the former national outlying areas of Russia to rise to the level of development of its center as rapidly as possible. The problem was resolved successfully. In this case the close cooperation among all nations in the country, the selfless aid of the Russian people above all, played a most important role."

Therefore, the experience of the Soviet Union indicates the way to the elimination of "dead-end" situations caused by the increasing lagging of the developing countries. However, the problem lies precisely in the fact that the capitalist countries, the economic development of which is based on the pursuit of profit, are unable to make major sacrifices for the sake of the economic development of other nations.

This inability of capitalism to enhance the economic standard of backward countries to the level of the economically advanced ones is a manifestation of one of the aspects of the ideological and moral decline of the bourgeois world compared with socialism. For the first time in the history of mankind, tremendous economic and social changes and unparalleled social progress in terms of scale and intensiveness in the Soviet Union, which allowed the backward nations to reach the level of the leading ones, sometimes bypassing socioeconomic systems, took place with the selfless aid of a more developed nation which deliberately undertook to make major material sacrifices for the sake of other nations. This is a most convincing proof of the superiority of the new civilization which is displaying to the world incomparably higher moral-political norms of social life as a result of which, for the first time in the history of mankind, social development becomes subordinated to the development of higher humanistic objectives.

In celebrating the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR, the Soviet people share a feeling of justifiable pride. Having surmounted the tremendous difficulties which are experienced by anyone who blazes new paths in social development, it opened new horizons to mankind. The Soviet Union implemented the splendid dream of the best minds about a just society in which all oppression has been eliminated and in which the peoples live in a state of harmony and brotherhood. In the eyes of progressive mankind the Soviet Union appears as the embodiment of the lofty socialist ideals and true humanism, as the inspirer in the struggle for social justice and national liberation and the hope of all progressive forces for a better future on earth.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

L. I. BREZHNEV'S SPEECH IN BAKU

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 15-20

[Speech by L. I. Brezhnev at the ceremony held in Baku on the occasion of the presentation of the Order of Lenin to the Azerbaijan SSR on 26 September 1982]

[Text] Dear Comrade Aliyev!

Dear comrades!

Today I am about to present the republic with the high award of the homeland --the Order of Lenin. As we know, Azerbaijan is being awarded this order for its great achievements in the implementation of the 10th Five-Year Plan for the production of industrial and agricultural commodities (applause).

Now the flag of the Azerbaijan SSR will carry three Orders of Lenin along with the Orders of the October Revolution and Friendship Among the Peoples (applause). This is a vivid confirmation of the labor heroism of the Azerbaijani people and their loyalty to the immortal Leninist cause (lengthy applause).

Let us particularly note among the many great accomplishments of Azerbaijan its increasing contribution to the country's economy. With every passing year the republic is fulfilling and overfulfilling the state plans for economic and social development and high socialist obligations and is increasing the volume of public output. This, as you know, was highly rated at the 26th CPSU Congress (applause).

The last industrial and agricultural five-year plan was fulfilled in 4 years and 2.5 months. The 1981 plan for these sectors was completed ahead of schedule. Major electric power, petroleum refining, machine building and light and food industry projects were commissioned on time. You are doing successful work in the current year of 1982 (applause).

The republic's working people are doing a great deal to implement the country's Food Program. Last year they delivered to the state more than 1 million tons of cotton, more than 1.6 million tons of grapes and 640,000 tons of vegetables (applause).

I note with great pleasure that once again Azerbaijan is the first among the union republics to fulfill its socialist obligations on grain sales to the

state (applause). Please accept, dear comrades, the warm gratitude of the party's Central Committee and the government for this great labor victory (lengthy applause).

What is the key to these successes? Above all the fact that the CP of Azerbaijan Central Committee and its bureau, headed by our respected comrade Geydar Aliyevich Aliyev, are principle-mindedly, systematically and energetically implementing the party's line (applause), and the fact that the party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations and economic organs in the republic are working in an organized and purposeful fashion, hitting, as the saying goes, the same target (applause).

They were able to lead the working people in the struggle for the implementation of the plans in all sectors and for all indicators and to educate the cadres in a spirit of high responsibility for assignments (applause). Economic development tasks are being implemented on the firm base of further increases in production efficiency, acceleration of scientific and technical progress and improvements in the style and methods of economic management (applause).

This indicates a proper and efficient approach, skillful party leadership, creative attitude toward the work and development of criticism and self-criticism. Your experience confirms, yet once again, how important control and supervision of execution, discipline and organization, reliance on the initiative of labor collectives, steady improvements in work with cadres and high exigency are.

We note with satisfaction that a good work feeling dominates in the republic, a healthy moral and political atmosphere, and a spirit of internationalism and fraternity among peoples (lengthy applause).

Four years ago, speaking at the ceremonies in Baku, I expressed a number of remarks and wishes. I recall mentioning the quality of output, shortcomings in services, and better use of labor resources. Today I note with satisfaction that the republic party organization has drawn the necessary conclusions from this criticism and improved the situation in many sectors although not all problems have been resolved.

Answering criticism with action is a manifestation of high party responsibility and the proper understanding by the party members of their duty to the party and the people (applause).

On the occasion of this new meeting, comrades, allow me to draw your attention to some problems which must be resolved more energetically.

Azerbaijan is the oldest supplier of petroleum in the country. It has acquired tremendous experience in its extraction, now benefitting other areas. To this day the republic is producing more than 14 million tons of petroleum annually. Two-thirds of it are extracted from the bottom of the Caspian Sea.

In recent years, however, there has been a decline in petroleum extraction. Naturally, working conditions have become considerably more complex. Drilling is taking place at greater depths and farther into the sea. This demands new technical and organizational solutions. We believe that such problems can be resolved by the petroleum workers of Azerbaijan who have great innovational traditions (applause). The problem not only of stabilizing petroleum extraction but increasing it can and must be resolved (applause).

We have almost completed the drafting of the country's energy program. New efforts will have to be made to strengthen the power industry in all republics, including that of Azerbaijan. This involves technical retooling of the petroleum and gas production and refining industries, the installation of new energy-generating capacities, and the strictest possible system of energy conservation. Particularly important in this connection is the timely completion of the Azerbaijan and Shamkhor electric power plants and the plant for deep-water foundations for the extraction of petroleum from the bottom of the sea.

As a whole, the party organizations in your republic have strengthened their control over the implementation of national economic plans. However, this control is still insufficiently efficient in housing construction. Frequently housing, schools, kindergartens and other social projects are not being completed on time. The construction quality of such projects remains inadequate. This, comrades, means disorder. The needs of the people must always be given priority in our country (lengthy applause).

Also needed is the adoption of the strictest possible approach to the allocation of housing. The CPSU Central Committee is receiving a number of complaints on such matters, including some from Azerbaijan. The Baku city party committee acted properly by making a principle-minded party assessment of cases of violations of the established procedure in occupying available premises (applause).

The following problem is equally important: bearing in mind the steady annual increase in crop growing in the republic, insufficient use is still being made of the possibility of increasing the production of meat, milk, eggs and other comestible items. The reserves here lie in radically improving animal husbandry and organizing livestock breeding and feed production. The agricultural workers of Azerbaijan can substantially increase the production of potatoes in order to satisfy population requirements in full.

In terms of weather conditions, this was not a good year for the Transcaucasus and for the country at large. The rural workers, our entire people are engaged in an intensive struggle for the crops. It is important to preserve each kilogram of grain, vegetables, fruits and potatoes and to get the entire output from the field to the consumer. All party, soviet and economic organizations must become concerned with this (lengthy applause).

Here, in Baku, I cannot avoid saying a few words on the extremely rich resources of the Caspian shores and other parts of Azerbaijan in terms of

improving the health of the people. The beneficial Caspian Sea, the southern sun, and the mountains and valleys of Azerbaijan must draw the people to themselves for rest and treatment.

I know that the republic's communist party Central Committee has shown initiative in the study of such possibilities. This project must be developed properly. We must think of the creation of one more southern resort area of unionwide significance. The AUCCTU and USSR Ministry of Health should become involved as well (lengthy applause).

Comrades!

We have repeatedly discussed the great importance of production, state and party discipline. Let me now mention in particular the problem of moral discipline, the more so since it is precisely in Azerbaijan that a great deal has been accomplished of late in the struggle against the opposites of socialist morality and for improving the education of the people. Good experience has been gained (applause).

The moral foundations of the socialist society rest on respect for and trust in man. It is no secret, however, that we still come across people who use this trust to the detriment of society, who display lack of modesty and who even take the path of cheating the state through eye-washing, bribery and theft of socialist property.

Intolerance of those who violate our morality and Soviet laws must imbue all social life. The observance of the norms of public morality and law must become the natural need of every Soviet person, an inviolable inner law. This is one of the main tasks in education. This is a major field of work for party and soviet organizations, trade unions, the Komsomol, the press, the television and the radio (applause).

Art, including motion pictures and the theater, is a major educational force which is far from fully used. In Azerbaijan, incidentally, good examples may be found of a militant "invasion" on the part of the motion picture, theater and literature in social life (applause). It is important to wage an active struggle in all directions against those who hinder our progress (applause).

Comrades, the regular accountability and election campaign has begun in the party. My wish is that in your republic as well, as throughout the country, it may be carried out under the sign of efficiency and concreteness, a critical evaluation of results and the mobilization of the forces of the party and the people for the solution of the major problems facing us (applause).

If the accountability and election campaign is conducted in this spirit--and I am confident that such will be the case--it will provide a new impetus to the struggle for the implementation of the five-year plan and for meeting honorably the 60th anniversary of the founding of the Soviet Union (lengthy applause).

Comrades! The successes achieved by the working people in Azerbaijan as in all the other republics in our country in increasing industrial and

agricultural output are a proper contribution to the implementation of the party's plans for steadily improving the life of the people and our communist construction (applause).

They also firmly increase the weight which our homeland carries in the international arena and are a support in our struggle for rescuing mankind from the threat of a nuclear conflagration, and in the struggle for lasting peace on earth (lengthy applause).

Of late, on several occasions I have had the opportunity to speak on foreign policy. The last time was in connection with the visit of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, India's prime minister, to Moscow. That is why today I shall discuss no more than a few individual aspects.

Let me say first of all that the Soviet-Indian summit talks held in Moscow have given us sincere satisfaction. They reasserted the fact that the friendship and cooperation between the USSR and India rest on solid foundations and have good prospects (applause). New steps were taken in the development of such cooperation.

Both sides were also given the opportunity to note the coincidence or similarity of views on basic problems of the international situation, particularly in terms of safeguarding peace and preventing a new world war.

In the course of our talks with the Indian prime minister, we once again expressed our positive assessment of the nonalignment movement as an important factor which works in favor of improving the international situation, and India's role in this movement.

In general, the Soviet Union stands for upgrading the role in international affairs of countries freed from the colonial or semicolonial yoke, which have chosen the path of independence and progress. We are convinced that the policies of such countries could have a beneficial impact on world circumstances (applause).

It is natural, therefore, for the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to be active supporters of strengthening peaceful cooperation and the unity and solidarity among Asian, African and Latin American countries, and the strengthening of the prestige and effectiveness of some of their organizations, such as the Organization of African Unity, the Arab League, and others (applause).

Imperialism, with its neocolonialist policy, remains the obvious foe of unity among liberated countries. It is no accident that the imperialists are doing everything possible to intensify the division within the ranks of the Arab countries and to weaken the prestige and influence of the OAU. They try to use the Organization of American States in the interests of the colonizing ambitions of the Western powers, as the recent events in the South Atlantic clearly proved.

You know, comrades, that for many years and even decades the Soviet Union has promoted detente. To us detente is a rather broad concept. It means above all a general direction taken by the countries and their leaders not toward preparations for war and hostility toward other countries but toward peaceful cooperation with them. It means normal contacts among countries and peoples, a conscientious respect for the norms of international law and the sovereignty of the individual countries and noninterference in reciprocal domestic affairs. Finally, it means the constant aspiration to contribute through practical action to restraining the arms race which has gripped the world, and the desire to strengthen security on the basis of the gradual intensification of mutual trust on a just and reciprocal basis.

Such is our understanding of detente and such is the type of detente we wish. Actually, it is a question of ensuring the peaceful future of all mankind (lengthy applause).

We do not believe in the least that detente could or should be the monopoly of a specific geographic area or part of the world. The fact that by virtue of a number of historical reasons it has already sunk deeper roots in some places than in others--in Europe, for instance--is a different matter. However, possibilities of strengthening detente exist everywhere and must be actively used.

I will not discuss here our efforts to establish relations with the United States and to achieve just and mutually acceptable agreements on problems of limiting and reducing strategic and medium-range nuclear weapons, as you are well familiar with them.

As to Asia, we would consider the normalizing and gradual improvement of relations between the USSR and the People's Republic of China quite important. It should be based, I would say, on common sense, mutual respect and mutual benefits. Added to the relations of friendship and cooperation which we have already established with a number of Asian countries, this would be a good contribution to strengthening the foundations of peace and stability in Asia and throughout the world (applause).

In Europe, it is our view that the most suitable immediate step for strengthening detente should be the successful conclusion of the Madrid meeting of the 35 countries and clearing the way for a European disarmament conference.

Incidentally, we should note here the constructive and peace-loving role which the neutral and nonaligned European countries are playing in Madrid. We wish them further success in this matter (applause).

The further strengthening of detente in Europe would make it possible for the Europeans to make even better use of its results and to resolve through joint efforts many problems in the practical life of the nations shared by the entire continent. Some forms of such cooperation are beginning to develop. Steadfast progress along this path is the duty of our generation to the generations of the future (lengthy applause).

As a whole, detente is a historical gain of the nations. In no case should it be allowed to be distorted by narrowly thinking egotistical politicians in the imperialist countries. It must be protected, developed and intensified.

This will be a victory of the human mind over a dangerous thoughtless aggressiveness (applause). We are confident of this victory, for we believe in the human intelligence and, if you wish, in the instinct of self-preservation of the nations (applause).

Such are the noble objectives pursued by the foreign policy of our country and the international activities of the CPSU (applause). Here again our allies are all peace-loving countries, all soberly thinking and realistic leaders in the world and the multimillion-strong masses the world over (lengthy applause).

The words of the great Lenin to the effect that the Soviet state "wishes to live in peace with all nations and to direct all its forces on internal construction" will remain our eternal guiding star" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Completed Collected Works], vol 39, p 366) (lengthy applause).

Dear comrades!

In conclusion, allow me to wish the working people of Soviet Azerbaijan new successes in the implementation of the party and state plans for economic and social development (tempestuous and lengthy applause).

I am confident that you will continue to be worthy of your great traditions and will welcome with new good accomplishments the forthcoming outstanding anniversary--the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR (lengthy applause).

May Soviet Azerbaijan long live and achieve new successes (stormy applause)!

Long live our great and powerful homeland--the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (stormy applause)!

Glory to Lenin's party--the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (stormy applause)!

May there be lasting peace on our planet and fruitful cooperation among nations! (Stormy and lengthy applause. All the people rise. Shouts are heard: "Glory to the CPSU!" "Glory to the Soviet people!" "The party and the people are as one!").

Allow me now to present the order awarded to your republic.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

FROM THE TALK BETWEEN L. I. BREZHNEV AND THE LEADERS OF THE AZERBAIJAN SSR

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 21-23

[Text] Addressing himself to the participants in the meeting, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said:

Matters have developed in such a way that whenever we meet we engage in summing up the results of the work done by the republic for the implementation of our party plans. This enables us to assess successes, see shortcomings and earmark measures to eliminate them.

Relatively little time has passed since my last visit to Baku, in September 1978. However, these were years saturated with major and important events.

I have in mind above all the 26th CPSU Congress. All of us can see that the decisions it made became the base of all activities of the party and the people, confidently following the Leninist path.

The second year of the 11th Five-Year Plan is nearing its end. It was noted by the further growth of our economy and improved well-being of the people.

However, as you know, we are faced with resolving major problems in economic sectors such as agriculture, power industry and transportation. The party and the government focused their attention on such matters. Currently, in particular, extensive work is being done to implement the decisions of the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee plenum and the country's Food Program.

The policy of the communist party enjoys the unanimous support of the people. This is also confirmed by the results of the elections for local soviets of people's deputies, which took place last June.

The current year is crowned by the great holiday of our multinational homeland--the 60th anniversary of the founding of the USSR. The Soviet people are preparing for its suitable welcome.

The Azerbaijan SSR is making a major contribution to the development of our country's economy, science and culture. During the new five-year plan the republic has achieved good results in industry and agriculture, particularly in increasing the production of cotton, grapes and vegetables. The funds

appropriated by the state are being used efficiently. A number of good initiatives were launched in the republic and acknowledged throughout the country.

As a whole, we value highly the work of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and Central Committee bureau, headed by Comrade Geydar Aliyevich Aliyev, and the republic's supreme soviet and council of ministers. Your aspiration to work creatively, with initiative and with a constant search for the new is worthy of support. This represents true party efficiency.

However, our communist tradition states that while rendering their due to successes, we must concentrate on shortcomings and think of unresolved problems. Let us do the same now.

Let us consider Azerbaijan's industry and, specifically, petroleum extraction. A certain stagnation has been noted in your republic in its development. This can be largely explained by the slow pace of technical retooling in the sector. The correction of this situation largely depends on your initiative and persistence. On the sea shelf the level of the development of the deposits still lags behind contemporary requirements and the achievements of science and technology.

The deep underwater drilling platform which we examined is a good installation. However, this could only be considered as the first or one of the first harbingers. The task is comprehensively to accelerate the development and production of new technical facilities for petroleum and natural gas extraction in the Caspian Sea. You should be concerned in particular with the fastest possible completion of the plant for the manufacturing of deep-water stationary platforms, currently under construction in the republic.

Naturally, the efficient use of such a valuable raw material as petroleum is very important, particularly that produced in your area. We must ensure its further intensified refining and improve the quality of petroleum products, lubricants in particular. The resources of raw materials for the petrochemical industry must be increased.

Currently the necessary conditions are being created in your republic to this effect. The program earmarked by the republic's party organization for the radical reconstruction and modernization of the petroleum refining industry is being implemented. Meanwhile, however, nearly one-half of the petroleum products coming out of the republic's plants are delivered as fuel oil. Naturally, this cannot be tolerated.

The new technical production standard must be consistent with the qualitatively new standard of output. This is the purpose of technical progress.

Naturally, we must ensure the rational utilization and conservation not only of petroleum but of all other material resources as well. I hope, comrades, that you will set an example of persistence and high efficiency in the solution of this most important problem as well.

Since we are discussing the use of natural resources, I would advise you to study the possibility of using thermal waters as a source of energy. Your republic is rich in such waters. Why not adapt them to heat housing and industrial buildings and greenhouses? Clearly, this is a project worth undertaking.

Another important problem is the following: the number of republic enterprises which are failing to fulfill their marketing plans has diminished. Currently they amount to 4.4 percent. However, if we consider this indicator in accordance with the implementation of procurement obligations, the picture changes, showing a large number of lagging enterprises. Comrades, this represents disorder. It disturbs the production rhythm and, in the final account, harms the national economy and undermines planning discipline.

We must enhance the prestige of contractual obligations and respect the need of related enterprises. Proper work should be done on this problem by economic managers, party committees and primary party organizations.

Now as to agriculture. I already pointed out the stable pace of development of this sector in Azerbaijan. I was told that this year the plans for the production of cotton, grain, grapes and vegetables will be considerably overfulfilled. This will be a good contribution by the Azerbaijani farmers to the fulfillment of the production program.

Not so long ago the CPSU Central Committee deemed it necessary to draw once again the attention of party, soviet and economic organs, scientists, managers and specialists in kolkhozes and sovkhozes to problems of implementation of radical measures aimed at increasing grain and feed production in the country. Here again I would like to mention in particular the attitude toward the land--the main resource of our people. Thrifty and scientific farming offers great opportunities for increasing the production of agricultural commodities.

Let us take irrigated land as an example. Today Azerbaijan has more than 1.2 million hectares in such land. However, returns from them remain inadequate and grain crop harvests on irrigated land remain low. One of the reasons for this is the salinity of irrigated areas. The flushing of the land is too slow and irrigational standards are low. A considerable share of the irrigation systems is in poor condition.

Comrades, negligence should not be tolerated. The republic's party organization must see to the solution of a qualitatively new problem--raising two to three crops per year per irrigated hectare. Consider this a party assignment.

Substantial reserves exist in animal husbandry as well. Although in recent years you have increased your meat and milk output, in many republic kolkhozes and sovkhozes productivity remains low.

The shortcomings in animal husbandry are largely the result of the poor feed base and insufficient feed procurements. A substantial portion of the

nutritive value of the fodder is lost as the result of violations in production, storage and processing technology. The republic averages one feed shop per three to four farms. As you can see, specialists and economic managers as well as party and soviet organs have something to think about.

I know that you analyzed critically the current condition of animal husbandry at the CP of Azerbaijan Central Committee plenum and earmarked a long-term comprehensive program for its intensification. This is a proper and a timely step.

Other problems exist as well, comrades. They too are of major importance in terms of the economy and social progress. In particular, you must improve matters in many areas of capital construction and transportation. Further improvements in the utilization of labor resources remains a topical task.

In discussing the topical nature of the struggle against violations of Soviet laws and socialist morality, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted that conditions which permit criminals to steal the people's property, harm the state and engage in antisocial actions remain in a number of economic and administrative units. It is your direct duty, he emphasized, to energize even further along all lines the struggle against such phenomena which are harmful and dangerous to society. Relying on previous accomplishments is totally impermissible.

In conclusion, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said:

The republic party organization has more than 345,000 members. It has always been a combat force of our party. The republic's communist party Central Committee acts properly by trying to rely on the gorkoms, raykoms and primary party organizations in all matters. The activeness of these most important units must be comprehensively upgraded in the future as well. Their initiative must be developed and they must be given aid and support.

A great deal remains to be done, comrades. New efforts will be demanded of the party members and all working people in the republic.

Finally, Leonid Il'ich wished the republic's leadership and all working people of Azerbaijan great success in their forthcoming accomplishments.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

L. I. BREZHNEV'S ANSWER TO THE APPEAL OF VENEZUELAN POLITICAL AND SOCIAL PUBLIC FIGURES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 24-25

[Text] Gentlemen!

I can well understand the concern for the future of the world on our planet you express in your message. This concern is shared by all Soviet people. In my speeches and answers to appeals by members of the public and political and state public figures and noted scientists I have frequently pointed out the horrible consequences of a nuclear war which threatens the very existence of civilization.

You mention the need for urgent and decisive action for the sake of blocking the threat of the outbreak of a new world war and easing international tension, which will make it possible for the nations confidently to follow the path of peace and social progress. Allow me to emphasize in this connection that the foreign policy of the Soviet state is directed precisely toward the achievement of such noble objectives.

The Soviet Union has done and is doing everything within its power to block above all the nuclear threat. Our specific initiatives in this direction are widely known. You are unquestionably familiar with the obligation unilaterally undertaken by the Soviet Union not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. With this act of historical significance we once again assured all countries of the inviolability of our peaceful intentions, the strictly defensive nature of our military doctrine and the absence of aspirations toward any kind of military superiority. We hope that the other nuclear powers will follow our example. In practice, such a "chain reaction" would be the general equivalent to a ban on nuclear weapons.

In order to strengthen the atmosphere of trust, the Soviet Union has reduced the strength of its forces and armaments in Central Europe and stopped the deployment and reduced the number of medium-range nuclear weapons which could reach targets in Western Europe.

We proceed from the fact that not only in Europe, where the military confrontation is felt particularly sharply, but in other parts of the world as well the peoples are striving for detente. The Soviet Union recently suggested

that the leading NATO and Warsaw Pact organs issue statements on the non-extension of the realm of action of such alliances in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The militaristic and aggressive circles of U.S. imperialism and their NATO allies are opposing this course. The arms race they have launched and the development of new types of mass destruction weapons are the main source of the aggravation of international tension and increased threat of war. Washington has added to its doctrine of "limited" war the concept of "protracted" nuclear war, from which it hopes to emerge the winner, relying on a first nuclear strike. The United States is accelerating its long-term armament programs and creating new military bases far beyond its territory. The United States has set up the so-called "rapid deployment force"--an instrument of the policy of contemporary colonizers, the purpose of which is to perform the tasks of a global policeman and to invade foreign territories. The result has been the appearance of dangerous conflict situations and "hot spots" in various parts of the world, be it the Middle East, the South Atlantic, Central America or the Caribbean basin.

Quite recently the world witnessed the crimes committed by the Israeli military in Lebanon and its use of the fascist methods of genocide against the suffering Palestinian people. It is entirely obvious that the Israeli rulers would have never dared to engage in such barbaric actions had they not relied on the support of the United States which, arming Israel and encouraging its aggressive aspirations, is pursuing its own objectives in that area.

The USSR is firmly in favor of the speediest possible just, durable and comprehensive settlement of the Middle Eastern problem, based on the total withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories and the satisfaction of the just demands of the Arab people of Palestine, ensuring their legitimate rights, including the right to have their own country, as well as ensuring the rights of all Middle Eastern countries to independent existence and development.

I fully share your concern that the situation in Central America and the Caribbean is fraught with serious danger. Let me emphasize that hotbeds of tension in this area appear through the fault of those who are trying to impose their will on the peoples who live there and to suppress their desire for freedom, national independence and progress. The Soviet Union has frequently proclaimed its firm conviction that strengthening the peace and security in Central America and the Caribbean, as in anywhere on earth, is possible only on the basis of respect for the sovereign right of each nation to determine its own destinies by itself, without outside interference, and to control its own natural resources.

We understand the desire of increasingly wide circles in Asian, African and Latin American countries to develop a situation of peace and good neighborly relations on their continents. We support the suggestions and initiatives of all countries demanding a political solution to disputes on a just basis through talks.

The threat of a new world war cannot be prevented, detente cannot be strengthened and its extension to all continents on earth is impossible through unilateral efforts. Today, in order to defend peace, we need more than ever before the collective actions of all countries--big and small--and all peace-loving forces regardless of their ideological views and political convictions.

Respectfully yours,

L. Brezhnev

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

K. MARX'S 'DAS KAPITAL' IN THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 26-37

[Article by L. Mis'kevich, candidate of economic sciences, and A. Chepurenko]

[Text] The translation of the first volume of K. Marx's "Das Kapital" came out in Petersburg in the spring of 1872. This was the first translation into a foreign language of the brilliant work by the founder of scientific communism.

Shortly before that time, the czarist censors were considering whether or not the Russian readers would see a translation of Marx's book. Having reviewed it, censor D. Skuratov wrote in his report to the Petersburg censorship committee: "One could confidently say that few people in Russia would read it and even fewer would understand it." The censor assumed that the ideas in "Das Kapital" would hardly cause any great harm to the czarist autocracy. "... The author's study," he noted profoundly, "applies exclusively to factory industry abroad, British primarily, while Russian factories are mentioned only incidentally in two or three places" ("Krasnyy Arkhiv" [Red Archives], vol 1 (56), 1933, p 7). A more farsighted colleague of his, censor De-Roberti, found in "Das Kapital" a significant threat to the existing social system. However, with poorly concealed displeasure, he was nevertheless forced to admit that "despite its clearly socialist trend, Karl Marx's work does not provide grounds for a court trial, there being no law which would make it possible to condemn this work in its Russian translation" (ibid., p 10).

Such was the sentence passed by czarist censorship. The judgment of history, however, was different. Marx had many judges, but who remembers them today? Meanwhile, the ideas of "Das Kapital" live and will live forever, everywhere, as they are alive on Russian soil, in the land of the soviets, in the homeland of V. I. Lenin.

In its 27 March (8 April) 1872 issue the newspaper SANKT-PETERBURGSKIYE VEDOMOSTI carried the first ad on the publication of the Russian translation of "Das Kapital:" "A new book is on sale in Cherkesov's Bookstore (54 Nevskiy Prospekt): "Capital. Critique of Political Economy. Work by Karl Marx. Translated from the German. Volume I. Process of Capital Production. St. Petersburg, 1872." Similar notices followed in MOSKOVSKIYE VEDOMOSTI, the journals ZNANIYE, OTECHESTVENNYYE ZAPISKI, VESTNIK YEVROPY, and others. Soon

afterwards, N. I. Utin, member of the Committee of the Russian Section of the First International, wrote to Marx in a state of happy excitement that "... for the third day running I have seen in a Russian newspaper (MOSKOVSKIYE VEDOMOSTI--the author) the announcement of the publication of your book and could hardly believe my eyes.... I congratulate you and, even more, I congratulate the Russian youth who will finally be able to become acquainted with your great principles on the basis of a reliable source" ("K. Marks, F. Engel's i Revolyutsionnaya Rossiya" [K. Marx and F. Engels and Revolutionary Russia]. Moscow, 1967, p 238).

Actually, by then Marx's work was quite well-known to the progressive circles of the Russian revolutionary democratic intelligentsia in its original language. K. A. Timiryazev, the outstanding Russian scientist, recalled that "... I was probably one of the first in Russia to become familiar with 'Das Kapital.' ... In the autumn of 1867, after leaving Simbirsk, where I was conducting experiments based on D. I. Mendeleev, I went to see P. A. Il'yenkov, in the recently opened Petrovskaya Academy. I found him in his office-library behind his desk. On the desk was a thick new German volume, still uncut. This was the first volume of Marx's 'Das Kapital.' Since the book had been published at the end of 1867, it was obvious that it was one of the first copies to fall into Russian hands. With admiration and his characteristic skill, Pavel Antonovich immediately delivered to me almost a whole lecture on what he had been able to read; he had been familiar with Marx's previous activities, for he had been abroad in 1848.... Therefore, several weeks after 'Das Kapital' was published, this professor of chemistry at the recently opened Petrovskaya Academy was already one of the first disseminators of the ideas of Marx in Russia" ("Russkiye Sovremenniki o K. Markse i F. Engel'se" [The Russian Contemporaries of K. Marx and F. Engels], Moscow, 1969, p 45).

G. Yeliseyev, the talented populist political journalist, used some of Marx's ideas in his debates with the ideologues of the nobility-landowning circles. In one of his articles he wrote that "... I deem it necessary to support my arguments by citing a scientific authority. I choose as such an authority the most talented and most honest of the contemporary political economists, Marx, known for his work 'Das Kapital,' 1867" (Gr. Yeliseyev, "Answer to Criticism," OTECHESTVENNIYE ZAPISKI, No 4, 1869, p 347).

Long before the appearance of the translation, "Das Kapital" was read and studied in Russia. In his article "Darwin's Theory and the Social Sciences," discussing the social division of labor, the noted populist sociologist N. K. Mikhaylovskiy pointed out that its true significance became apparent only in socialist literature and cited a number of excerpts from "Das Kapital" in which Marx considered the division of labor in society and in capitalist manufacturing (see OTECHESTVENNIYE ZAPISKI, No 1, 1870).

A number of references to "Das Kapital" may be found in the article by A. Makhaylov (pseudonym of the populist A. K. Sheller) entitled "Production Associations," in which the author refers to "Das Kapital" in support of his statements on the situation of the working class in the West (see DELO, No 4, 1870, pp 222, 225, 227 and 234).

V. I. Pokrovskiy, the noted economist and zemstvo statistician, wrote a special article on the subject of the working day as presented in "Das Kapital." He described Marx's basic ideas in language similar to the text or sometimes almost verbatim. Thus, he wrote that "in its essence, capital is nothing but buried labor. However, like a vampire it comes to life by sucking on live labor and the more it sucks the longer it lives" (OTECHESTVENNYYE ZAPISKI, No 4, 1870, p 407).

In the third volume of the "Archives of Forensic Medicine and Public Hygiene," for 1870, the article "On the Situation of the Workers in Western Europe from the Sociohygienic Viewpoint," authored by P. I. Yakobi and V. A. Zaytsev, who had signed with the initials P. Ya., caused a great deal of anger. Making extensive use of actual data borrowed from the chapter in "Das Kapital" on the working day, the authors proved the objective socioeconomic reasons for the catastrophic situation of the working class under capitalism. The article was banned by the censors "for persistent promotion of extreme socialist ideas." Marx, who had been informed in detail about the case by G. A. Lopatin, ironically wrote to Z. Meyer in January 1871 that "... the author essentially quotes, indicating the source, my book. This has resulted in the following misfortune: the censor was most severely scolded by the minister of internal affairs, the editor in chief was replaced and the issue of the journal--all the still-available copies--was burned!" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 33, pp 146-147).

Thus, whereas in his homeland, in Germany, as he himself acknowledged, Marx's work was welcomed with a "conspiracy of silence," and created virtually no interest in specialists' circles, in the distant Eastern European country he immediately met with a warm response among the broad circles of the progressive free-thinking intelligentsia which, looking for an answer to the destinies of postreform Russia, attentively followed the development of Western European social thinking and was sympathetic to Marxism.

"Das Kapital" triggered a great deal of interest. It was no accident that O. Meyssner, the publisher of the first volume, in suggesting that Marx prepare a second edition, for the first (1,000 copies) had already been sold by the end of 1871, pointed out that demand for the book was particularly great in Russia.

The idea of translating "Das Kapital" into Russian had been born somewhat earlier.

As early as 1868 A. A. Serno-Solov'yevich, the Russian revolutionary in exile and member of the First International, had proclaimed his intention to translate the first volume of "Das Kapital." At the beginning of the 1860s he was one of the heads of "Land and Will." However, he abandoned his intention when he learned that V. O. Kovalevskiy, the noted Russian zoologist and zealous follower and propagandist of Darwin's theory of evolution, intended to translate "Das Kapital" in Russia.

However, he was not fated to carry out this noble undertaking. At the beginning of October 1868 Marx received a letter from N. F. Daniyel'son, someone

unknown to him at that time, which said the following: "The significance of your latest work--'Das Kapital. Critique of Political Economy'--has inspired a local publisher (N. P. Polyakov) to undertake the translation of this work into Russian" ("K. Marks, F. Engel's i Revolyutsionnaya Rossiya," p 158).

Marx welcomed the news with great joy. He immediately passed on the letter to Engels, noting that "naturally, I was quite pleased by the news that my book will be published in Petersburg in a Russian translation" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 32, p 140). It was roughly at that time that with obvious pleasure he shared the news with other friends. "... The first foreign nation to translate 'Das Kapital' turns out to be the Russian," he wrote to L. Kugelmann (ibid., p 472). Receiving Marx's letter with the news, F. Lessner, Marx's fellow worker in the Association of Communists, deemed it so important that he recorded the news on the copy of the German edition he had received as a gift from the author and in his answer to Marx wrote that "the news that your work had been translated into Russian ... amazed and pleased me a great deal.... Obviously, the Russians have better taste than the progressive English and the babbling French.... I hope that this will shame other nations, those who claim to be setting the tone are learning the new great revolutionary ideas and examples of the German scientists with the help of the Russians (ISTORIK-MARKSIST, vol 5-6 (45-46), 1935, p 160).

But who were the people who had undertaken to translate and publish "Das Kapital" in Russian? N. F. Daniyel'son, who had written to Marx, and who subsequently was to become a noted ideologue of liberal populism, and who corresponded with Marx and, after his death, with Engels for a number of years, was at that time a 24-year-old employee at the Petersburg Mutual Credit Society. He was a member of the circle of the Russian Raznochintsy Democratic Youth, which had been founded in 1867 in Petersburg by university alumnus G. A. Lopatin, a fiery revolutionary and an outstanding individual. Other members of the circle were M. F. Negreskul and N. N. Lyubavin, who subsequently became a professor of chemistry at Moscow University. The members of the circle studied with interest European socialist literature and followed the development of the labor and democratic movements abroad with tireless attention and sympathy. They were familiar with many of Marx's works. It was precisely the members of this circle who undertook to translate and to publish the first volume of "Das Kapital" in Russia.

This was no simple task. After N. F. Daniyel'son was able to find a publisher willing to publish the translation of "Das Kapital," who was N. P. Polyakov, a member of his own generation, the question of the translator arose. In 1869 N. N. Lyubavin, who was then in Berlin, learned from the other member of the Lopatin circle, M. F. Negreskul, that M. A. Bakunin, the Russian revolutionary and ideologue of anarchism, was in great straits. N. F. Daniyel'son and N. N. Lyubavin, who valued him as a revolutionary, having secured N. P. Polyakov's agreement, decided to commission Bakunin with the translation. They immediately shipped to him a package of books needed for the work and an advance royalty. Several months passed in fruitless expectation and it was only at the end of December 1869 that M. A. Bakunin sent Lyubavin a few translated pages. The translation was poor however and unusable. Bakunin, the anarchist, never understood or acknowledged Marxist

theory. He considered "Das Kapital" nothing but "economic metaphysics" (see LITERATURNNOYE NASLEDSTVO, No 41-42, 1941, p 151). In a letter to Lyubavin, discussing the familiar "Das Kapital" definition that value means past labor, Bakunin noted that "Marx is simply joking--actually this is something he acknowledged to me personally" (ibid., p 158).

By the spring of 1870 it had become entirely clear that another translator was needed. The role was assumed by 25-year-old G. A. Lopatin who, after a successful escape from exile at the start of 1870, had gone abroad and that same summer had settled in London, where he became close to Marx.

Lopatin was an amazing character. P. L. Lavrov, the noted ideologue of Russian populism, referred to him as one of the "most talented Russian people." He wrote that eventually "a person will be found who will have the luck ... to have the material for a biography as interesting as a romantic novel of adventure and to deal with a personality who had been offered a university chair the moment he graduated; a writer whose brilliant letters enchanted Turgenev; a philosopher greatly respected by Karl Marx, who found it quite difficult to respect others; a public figure who stopped at no difficulty; and, at the same time, an interlocutor who could charm one and all, who was the soul of any gathering and who could attract with equal success a petty tyrant such as the governor-general of Eastern Siberia or a scientist, a young girl or a cautious forced-labor prisoner, or a revolutionary fanatic. With sufficient material and the ability of a writer to understand a personality and clearly present it in its characteristic features and the entire variety of its power, this would be a work which would be read and which could bring its author literary fame" (P. L. Lavrov, "German Aleksandrovich Lopatin," Petersburg, 1919, pp 15-16). Lavrov was right: after Gleb Uspenskiy had met Lopatin he developed the idea for a novel about a "daring youth," which would describe the life of this revolutionary hero. I. S. Turgenev referred to Lopatin with exceptional warmth. Marx highly valued his young Russian friend.

They met in the summer of 1870 and Lopatin's charm was such that their very next meeting, as Marx recalls, lasted "from noon to midnight...." (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 32, p 430). Subsequently, describing that day spent in Marx's home, Lopatin wrote that "I cannot say that Marx's welcome was gracious, for the term would be inadequate: it was actually warm rather than gracious. His wife told me that she would feel hurt if, being in London, I would think of taking a hotel room...." ("Russkiye Sovremenniki o K. Markse i F. Engel'se," p 130).

It was during that meeting that Marx agreed to the translation of the first volume of "Das Kapital" by Lopatin.

Lopatin undertook the work immediately. Here again, in working on the translation, he showed a new feature of his character--he was a thoughtful and superbly theoretically trained scientist.

He began the translation with the second chapter (second section in subsequent editions) "Conversion of Money Into Capital." The first chapter had

to be reedited by Marx himself. The reason was that the most complex section in the first chapter "Commodity and Money," which discussed the form of value, had two presentations in the German 1867 edition: in the main text and in a special appendix to the book, in which Marx had tried to describe the dialectics of the development of the internal contradiction within the commodity, the basic form of wealth of bourgeois society, as simply as possible, for the benefit of students, for the "nondialectical" reader. Marx intended to eliminate this double presentation in a subsequent edition. Since the Russian translation of the first volume was to become the first reedition of Marx's work, as Lopatin subsequently recalled, the author advised him to begin with the second chapter, "promising by the time my translation was completed, to combine the first chapter with the appendix in a more generally accessible form" ("Russkiye Sovremenniki o K. Markse i F. Engel'se," p 53).

That is precisely what Lopatin did. On a parallel basis, he studied the works of bourgeois economists frequently cited by Marx. Here again he proved to be quite conscientious and thorough. He was frequently able to notice in the authors referred to by Marx areas which required additional analysis and criticism. For example, noting the confusion in the views of Senior, who converted part of the product into part of the working day, Lopatin pointed this out to Marx. The latter agreed with the translator and made the necessary addition to Note 34 (in subsequent editions Note 32, Chapter VII), which appeared for the first time precisely in the Russian edition. In some areas Lopatin commented on the text, clarifying concepts difficult to translate. Thus, in the discussion of money as a means of turnover, Marx had introduced the new word "Geldlarve," which came from the German "Geld" (money) and "Larve" (larva). In one of his notes Lopatin explained this expression as follows: "... The author compares money at a certain stage of its metamorphosis to the metamorphosis of insects" ("Das Kapital. Critique of Political Economy. Work by Karl Marx," translated from the German, vol 1, book 1. "Process of Production of Capital," St. Petersburg, 1872, p 61, footnote).

We find on p 92 the following note to the translation of the term "Mehrwert": "Initially we intended to translate the expression 'Mehrwert' as 'supervalue,' the structure of which is entirely consistent with the spirit of the Russian language and which also offers the advantages of a single complex word compared to two simple ones. But then, however, we would have been forced to translate it as 'added value,' in order to preserve the etymological analogy with the word 'added labor' (Mehrarbeit), consistent with the analogy which exists between these two terms in economics. Naturally, it would have been better to translate Mehrarbeit with a single word. Unfortunately, words such as Mehrarbeit, Mehrproduct and others have no Russian equivalents."

Elsewhere Lopatin draws the attention of the reader to the fact that although the norm of the added value may remain the same, the situation of the worker may show a substantial disparity. "The reader must always bear in mind," Lopatin wrote, "that the norm of the added value and the sum total of added value are quite different. Let us assume in one case that the necessary labor equals 3 hours; the added labor would also equal 3 hours; in the other

case the necessary labor would equal 6 hours and the added labor would also equal 6 hours. It is obvious that the norm of the added value, i.e., the level of exploitation of the worker will be the same in both cases (i.e., 100 percent); however, the situation of the worker, both physical and moral, i.e., the sum total of his difficulties in the two cases, would be quite different (in one of the cases it would be the double of the second)" (ibid., p 163).

Some of the notes are referential. Thus, Lopatin provides a brief characteristic of chartism, and data on the German simplistic bourgeois economist M. Wirte, the British currency system, and so on.

In the course of the translation, Lopatin sought Marx's advice on some complex passages and the choice of proper terminology. All of this enabled him profoundly to penetrate into the very spirit of Marx's economic theory and ensure the high level of the Russian translation.

However, Lopatin was unable to complete his work. He returned to Russia in the autumn of 1870 but in February 1871 he was arrested in Irkutsk. He later recalled that "after translating about one-third of the book, the second and third chapters in particular and, I recall, the beginning of the fourth, I interrupted my work for a while for a trip to Siberia related to the release of Chernyshevskiy. As a result of an act of carelessness I committed in Geneva, my undertaking 'withered away without blossoming,' and I found myself in the Irkutsk stockade for quite some time. It was then that Daniyel'son, my university classmate and lifelong friend, undertook to complete my translation, closely following my terminology" ("Russkiye Sovremenniki o K. Markse i F. Engel'se," p 53). It was thus that the circle was closed: Daniyel'son, who was one of the inspirers of the Russian edition of "Das Kapital," now assumed the role of translator as well.

Daniyel'son undertook the work but found it more difficult than did Lopatin: he could not seek Marx's advice and, furthermore, in his own admission, he found foreign languages "difficult" (see "K. Marks, F. Engel's i Revolyutsionnaya Rossiya," p 392).

In May 1871 Daniyel'son informed Marx, who knew the purpose of Lopatin's return to Russia, about his fate and the condition of the translation: "The translator of your 'Das Kapital,' following his departure, last autumn, had no time for this work, for he was traveling constantly. In his initial letters he wrote that following his return he would complete the translation himself. However, when this return proved to be postponed indefinitely, he asked me to finish the translation.... The translation is now nearing the end...." ("K. Marks, F. Engel's i Revolyutsionnaya Rossiya," p 196). After a while Daniyel'son turned to Marx once again, this time with the request for the small corrections which the latter intended to make in various chapters, and in November 1871 Marx sent to Petersburg several such changes made in the text for the benefit of the Russian translation.

By that time Daniyel'son had completed the work on the fourth chapter "Production of Relative Added Value," started by Lopatin, and had translated the

fifth chapter "Further Study of the Production of Absolute and Relative Added Value" as well as the sixth chapter "Process of Capital Accumulation," and stopped as he waited for the revision of the first chapter as promised by Marx. Unfortunately, Marx was forced to tell Daniyel'son that "it would be useless to wait for the rewriting of the first chapter, for in recent months I have been so busy (and hardly expect any improvement in the future), that I am totally unable to resume my theoretical works" (K. Marks and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 33, p 265). This was a period during which, following the London conference of the First International (September 1871), which had summed up the lessons of the Paris Commune and had struck a hard blow at anarchism in the labor movement, the anarchists--Bakunin's supporters--undertook the direct splitting of the international. Under those circumstances Marx, as the leader of the International Association of Workers, naturally, could not find the time necessary to prepare the Russian edition of "Das Kapital," despite its great importance.

Daniyel'son, as Lopatin subsequently wrote, "was forced to produce Volume 1 of 'Das Kapital' in its initial form, and the first chapter and its appendix were translated not by him but by yet another comrade" ("Russkiye Sovremenniki o K. Markse i F. Engel'se," pp 53-54). Lopatin did not name him by name, for by then this "third comrade," N. N. Lyubavin, had become a "loyal" professor. While working on the translation Lyubavin, Daniyel'son's former classmate in the commerce school, was living in Berlin and was the intermediary in the correspondence between Marx and Daniyel'son.

The day finally came, 15 (27) March 1872, when triumphantly Daniyel'son was able to report to Marx that "the printing of the Russian translation of 'Das Kapital' has been finally completed and I can send you a copy of the book" ("K. Marks, F. Engel's i Revolyutsionnaya Rossiya," p 233).

F. Lessner, Marx's friend and fellow worker, recalled that "finally, when the first copy of 'Das Kapital' in Russian reached him from Petersburg, the event, as an important token of the time, became to Marx, his family and his friends a real triumph" ("Vospominaniya o Markse i Engel'se" [Recollections of Marx and Engels], Moscow, 1956, p 168).

In his answer dated 28 May 1872, Marx thanks Daniyel'son "for the beautifully bound copy," noting that "the translation is masterly." He went on to say that "I would like to have one more copy--unbound--for the British Museum" (K. Marks and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 33, p 402).

The record book of gifts of printed matter to the British Museum Library includes the following entry dated 24 July 1872: "Marx (Karl). 'Das Kapital. Critique of Political Economy.' First Printing. Hamburg, 1872. Marx (Karl). 'Das Kapital. Critique of Political Economy' (in the Russian language). Volume 1. St. Petersburg, 1872 (the title of the book given in German--the author). A gift from Dr. Karl Marx. Maitland Park Road, 1, Haverstock Hill (English entry--author)." Unfortunately, this copy of the Russian edition cannot be found. What was its fate and when and how was it lost? It may still be possible that the book will be found and it may have notes made by its author, at which point one more page will be added to the history of the Russian translation of "Das Kapital." ...

Marx and Engels, both of whom knew Russian, invariably praised the first translation of "Das Kapital." On 23 May 1872 Marx told F. Sorge: "An excellent Russian edition has come out in Petersburg" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 33, p 395). Somewhat later, in another letter to him, Marx again noted that the translation "was a masterly one" (ibid., p 414). The opinion was shared by Engels, who also believed that the Russian translation was "very good" (ibid., p 411).

The high rating which the founders of scientific communism gave to the translations made by Lopatin, Daniyel'son and Lyubavin is a confirmation of their unquestionable scientific merit. They were the first to develop a Marxist political-economic terminology which precisely reflected the nature of the concepts introduced in scientific circulation. It was no accident that subsequently P. B. Struve, one of the leaders of the so-called legal Marxism theory and the worst enemy of true Marxism, who had himself attempted to translate "Das Kapital," had begun by totally revising the terminology developed by its initial translators. In particular, everywhere he used the word "price" instead of "value." He realized that a truly scientific conceptual apparatus and proper terminology by themselves would be serious obstacles to the vulgarizing or debasing of Marx's economic theory. The Russian terminology for "Das Kapital," created by the initial translators, was a major accomplishment in domestic economic science.

The separate life of the Russian translation of the first volume of "Das Kapital" began in the spring of 1872. The 3,000 copies (triple the size of the first German edition), printed by N. P. Polyakov on the printing press of the Ministry of Railroads, in Fontanka, in Petersburg, were shipped to A. A. Cherkesov's bookstore. Who were those people--the publisher and the book merchant who most actively participated in the dissemination of "Das Kapital" in Russia?

V. V. Bervi (Flerovskiy), author of the book "The Situation of the Working Class in Russia," described Polyakov as follows: "... Polyakov, a man with nihilistic tendencies, who lives among people who shared Chernyshevskiy's views, was a publisher of books with extreme ideas. He was a man of ideas and published only works valuable in content but facing major censorship difficulties. He made most generous use of the law according to which books of considerable volume could be removed from circulation only by the courts.... He published essentially translations of most outstanding works printed in the civilized world. His objective was to publish them without any distortions, changes or abridgements and he stubbornly fought for each word. He met with a sad fate: once the government became fed up with freedom of the press, works worth 100,000 rubles were confiscated from him and he was ruined" (V. Bervi, "Memoirs." GOLOS MINUVSHEGO, No 1, 1916, p 211).

An equally interesting personality was that of Cherkesov, the book merchant. Of noble origin, a classmate of brothers M. A. and A. A. Serno-Solov'yevich, and an acquaintance of Herzen and Ogarev, he was an active participant in the organization of a printing press by Russian revolutionary exiles in Bern (Switzerland) at the beginning of the 1860s. He was a close acquaintance of Utin and Lopatin, members of the First International. In the second half of

the 1860s, risking detention, he returned to Russia where he purchased the bookstore of N. A. Serno-Solov'yevich, which was a center for the dissemination of the "Land and Will" propaganda publications, and which had declined after the detention of its owner. As owner of the bookstore, Cherkesov was repeatedly detained himself and searched, but on each occasion the Third Department was forced to release him for lack of sufficient proof. At the beginning of the 1870s Cherkesov's store was also an office and a repository for a number of democratic publishing houses and journals and enjoyed great popularity among the progressive intelligentsia. Approximately at the time of the translation of "Das Kapital," Cherkesov's store received A. N. Radishchev's "Travel From Petersburg to Moscow." "... A witty and gay interlocutor, an inordinately warm and hospitable person, and a rarely good and responsive man," was the way his friends remembered him (see O. K. Bulanova-Trubnikova, "Tri Pokoleniya" [Three Generations]. Moscow-Leningrad, 1928, p 87).

Cherkesov's store played a major role in the dissemination of the Russian translation of "Das Kapital" not only in Petersburg and Moscow but in other Russian cities as well. Thanks to the active efforts of Cherkesov and his assistants, 1.5 months following the publication of the Russian translation 900 copies had been sold, i.e., almost one-third of the entire edition--a figure which was almost unheard-of in the case of scientific publications. According to the populist N. S. Rusanov, the news of a great new book began spreading among the Russian intelligentsia from the capital to the big provincial centers and from the centers to all cities and elsewhere like wildfire...." (N. S. Rusanov, "Na Rodine. 1859-1882" [In the Homeland, 1859-1882], Moscow, 1931, p 95).

Marx showed great interest in the acceptance of "Das Kapital" in Russia. In December 1872 he wrote to Daniyel'son that "I am impatiently awaiting the promised criticism (handwritten) and any printed matter you have on this subject" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 33, p 458).

Daniyel'son sent to Marx all references in newspapers and journals. In his letters, Marx reported in detail such references to his book to his friends. In the postscript to the second German edition of the first volume, Marx proudly mentioned the publication of the Russian translation, the impressions of the Russian economist and professor at Kiev University N. I. Ziber and the review by V. I. Pokrovskiy in SANKT-PETERBURGSKIYE VEDOMOSTY, and extensively quoted from the article in the Petersburg journal VESTNIK YEVROPY, No 5, 1872. As Lenin said, Marx "extracted" from the flood of journal and newspaper notes on "Das Kapital" precisely the Russian review, for it provided, in the judgment of Marx himself, an entirely accurate description of the dialectical method used in "Das Kapital" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 1, p 167). Its author was 24-year-old I. I. Kaufman, subsequently a noted bourgeois economist and professor at Petersburg University. Unlike most reviewers, he saw as the basic distinction which separated "Das Kapital" from the plump treatises of bourgeois economists that which others had failed to see--its "soul," a systematic and substantial economic study of the materialistic understanding of history. Some 170 reviews and other publications citing or mentioning "Das Kapital" appeared in Russia in the 1870s.

Yet considering the czarist censorship, even a simple reference to Marx's works was proof not only of a broad scientific outlook but of the civic courage of the author.

The subsequent second and third volumes of "Das Kapital" were translated and published in Russian, as was the first part of Marx's work, almost immediately after the publication of the German originals. After Marx's death Engels, who had assumed the tremendous and most responsible assignment of editing and preparing for printing these parts of the book by his friend and fellow worker, assumed that Lopatin would do the translation. He believed that only the translator of the first volume should have the honor of translating the remainder of Marx's work. This time, however, Lopatin could not even begin the work. He returned to Russia clandestinely in 1884 but was caught in Petersburg and sentenced to death, a sentence which was later commuted to life imprisonment.

Once again Daniyel'son undertook to carry out his friend's plan. He started corresponding with Engels and in February 1885 obtained his agreement to do the translation. As early as March the first printer's proofs of the German edition of the second volume began to arrive in Petersburg. That same summer the second volume came out in German; its Russian edition came out in January 1886. This time Daniyel'son was not only the translator but the publisher as well.

The third volume of "Das Kapital," the preparation of which took Engels almost 10 years of intensive work, came out in 1894. Once again, as they came out, the printer's proofs of the German edition were sent to Daniyel'son in Petersburg. This volume proved to be not only very difficult because of the lesser amount of editing Engels had done, but also because of its exceptional translation difficulty. Although after a first reading Daniyel'son planned on completing the translation by the end of 1895, in reality the work turned out to be far more labor-intensive. Nevertheless, the Russian translation, which appeared at the end of 1896, once again became the first translation of this part of Marx's work into a foreign language.

The special interest in "Das Kapital" was based on the fact that "the main theoretical problem" which faced Russia in the postreform age, as Lenin said, was that of the "destinies of capitalism" (see op. cit., vol 1, p 275). At that time it was the populists who were disseminating the ideas of "Das Kapital." In the 1870s it was precisely they who were in the leading ranks of the fighters against czarist autocracy. They used "Das Kapital" as a powerful expository document, as a confirmation of the crying social evils of this social system. With the help of extensive factual data drawn from Marx's book, they tried to prove the historical limitations and futility of bourgeois society. Meanwhile, the populists sincerely believed in Russian originality, hoping that it would be able to bypass capitalist development and directly convert to a just social system. Be that as it may, it was precisely through the populist circles that the entire promotion of "Das Kapital" in Russia was carried out.

"My heart was thumping," recalls N. S. Rusanov, speaking of reading Marx's book, "when I undertook to read the work: I was 14-15 years old and I believed that I would find in 'Das Kapital' the key to all life, the solution of all the problems of the revolution...." (N. S. Rusanov, op. cit., p 96). The Petersburg circle of narodniki-chaykovtsy engaged in political agitation among workers and peasants. M. V. Kupriyanov was a member of the circle. "A 17-18-year-old youngster ... he knew (and how!) virtually by heart K. Marx's gigantic work. He could spend hours developing ... various concepts of Marx's theory, striking us with his inordinately fine analysis and the logic of his conclusions" (S. Chudnovskiy, "A Page From My Memoirs," BYLOYE, No 6/18, 1907, p 289).

The new stage in the dissemination of "Das Kapital" in Russia began with the creation of the "Liberation of Labor" group which set itself the great task in the 1880s of "... mastering the views of contemporary scientific socialism, disseminating them among the workers and, with the help of the workers, conquering the stronghold of autocracy" ("Literaturnoye Naslediye G. V. Plekhanova" [G. V. Plekhanov's Literary Legacy]. Collection, vol 8, part 1, Moscow, 1940, p 86). However, at the beginning of the 1890s Marxism and the ideas of "Das Kapital" had not as yet exerted a firm influence on the mass labor movement. The new page in the history of the dissemination of "Das Kapital" in Russia was tied to Lenin.

Lenin heard about "Das Kapital" for the first time from his elder brother, the university student Aleksandr. As an 18-year-old youngster, he was already seriously studying this work. "I remember how evenings, when I came down to see him for a chat, he described to me with great excitement and inspiration the foundations of Marx's theory and the new horizons it opened," recalls A. I. Ul'yanova-Yelizarova ("Vospominaniya o Vladimire Il'iche Lenine" [Recollections of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin]. In five volumes. Vol 1, Moscow, 1979, p 26). It was precisely at that time that Lenin had joined in Kazan one of the Marxist circles organized by N. Ye. Fedoseyev.

Lenin's private library contained a volume of "Das Kapital" in German and in Russian. He did not simply read them but approached Marx "as a person seeking an answer to painful and urgent problems." He found the answers. "It was with these answers that he approached the workers," N. K. Krupskaya recalls (N. K. Krupskaya, "Vospominaniya o Lenine" [Recollections of Lenin], Moscow, 1972, p 465).

In Samara, as early as 1892, Lenin engaged in active propaganda work. He read "Das Kapital" in the Marxist circle, discussed what he had read with the workers, and explained some of Marx's views with the help of specific examples drawn from daily life.

The volumes of "Das Kapital" which belonged to Lenin are covered with notes and underlinings. In some of the Russian editions some words have been stricken out, replaced by others which provided a more precise idea of the term, despite the fact that, as a rule, Lenin quoted his own translation of "Das Kapital." However, using the first Russian edition of the first volume of "Das Kapital," he emphasized that "the translation is perfectly accurate"

(op. cit., vol 1, p 171). It was precisely this edition that was carefully used by V. A. Bazarov and I. I. Skvortsov-Stepanov in preparing the new translation of "Das Kapital" by the bolsheviks in 1907-1909. Lenin was supposed to edit it. However, under the conditions of reactionary excesses, following the defeat of the first Russian revolution, this could not be accomplished.

Lenin's complete collected works contain more than 100 mentions, excerpts and references to the first volume of "Das Kapital." Under the Soviet system scrupulous work was carried out to find all places in Lenin's works in which, in his own translation, he cited Marx's works and proper corrections have been made in all translations.

According to the All-Union Chamber of Books, "Das Kapital" has been published in Russian and other languages of the peoples of our country in the USSR 183 times in a total number of 7,696,000 copies.

The victory of the October Revolution turned a new page in the history of the printing and distribution of "Das Kapital." Our party's special institution created on Lenin's initiative for the collection, storage and publication of the literary and manuscript legacy of the great founders of scientific communism (today the CPSU Central Committee Institute of Marxism-Leninism), and the preparation of the first and second editions of the works of Marx and Engels in Russian enabled the readers to study the rough drafts of Marx's brilliant work, to penetrate into his scientific laboratory and to understand more profoundly how in the course of several decades he proceeded to the creation of a proletarian political economy. In the second edition of the works, which was published after the death of their author, Marx's economic manuscripts account for several volumes. It was precisely the studies done by Soviet scientists that made possible the publication of such widely known works today as the "Economic-Philosophical Manuscript of 1844" (vol 42), "Economic Manuscripts of 1857-1859" (vol 46, parts 1-2), "Economic Manuscript of 1861-1863" (vol 26, parts 1-3 and volumes 47 and 48), and the rough draft of that part of Marx's work partially used by Engels in preparing for publication the second volume of "Das Kapital" (volumes 49, 50).

The publication of these manuscripts is of permanent significance in the development of Marxist-Leninist science. It is precisely these previously unknown extensive rough drafts that include the premises of the revolutionary change in social science which Marx accomplished with "Das Kapital." Here, step by step, he unraveled the secret of the creation of added value and the mechanism of capitalist exploitation. He described in detail many important phenomena in capitalist society--the formal and actual subordination of labor to capital, production and nonproduction labor, the role and place of science in capitalist social production and the conflicting social consequences of its development in an antagonistic society, and so on. These manuscripts express important ideas which refine our concepts on the nature of the dialectical method and its characteristics as applicable to "Das Kapital." Finally, it is precisely in them that we find many concepts of essential importance in terms of the scientific study of the socialist economy--such as the law of economy of time, the conversion of science into a direct production force, and others.

It is truly symbolic that the overwhelming majority of Marx's economic manuscripts and the preparatory drafts of his epoch-making work were published precisely in the Russian language. In his work "Karl Marx," Lenin wrote that "Marx's economic doctrine is the most profound, comprehensive and detailed confirmation and application of his theory" (op. cit., vol 26, p 60). Today Marxist theory, developed and enriched by Lenin, has been embodied in the practice of real socialism which became reality for the first time in our country. More than 1 century ago the first translation of the basic Marxist work came out in Russia. Today the USSR, in which Marx's manuscript legacy is carefully gathered and stored and having its rebirth, has become the second homeland of this great book.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

DARWIN'S REVOLUTION IN BIOLOGY AND ITS PHILOSOPHICAL ASPECTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 38-48

[Article by Academician N. Iribadzhakov (Bulgarian People's Republic)]

[Text] Charles Darwin, the great English scientist, died on 19 April 1882 in Down. Although he spent 40 years of his life here, engaged in tireless and exceptionally fruitful work, he was buried in London, in Westminster Abbey, alongside the great physicist Isaac Newton. This occurred 100 years ago and this year the scientific and progressive public the world over celebrates the year 1982 as Darwin's year.

Darwin wrote in his "Autobiography" that "works of science were my main pleasure and exclusive occupation throughout my life...." Darwin was at the peak of his creative powers when his scientific activities brought him world notoriety and fame which come to the greatest scientists and scientific revolutionaries frequently after their death. However, Darwin was motivated not by vain love for glory but by love for knowledge and truth and the desire to serve mankind.

The history of science is familiar with many revolutions of different scale. Charles Darwin is one of its revolutionaries. Usually, Darwin's revolution in science is compared with the revolutions made by Copernicus, Newton and Einstein. However, to this day a more precise answer to the question of what was the nature of this revolution and the role it played in the history of scientific and particularly philosophical knowledge is not a simple one.

The difficulty lies in the fact that Darwin's revolutionary influence was not restricted merely to biology. Directly or indirectly it has had an influence on all natural sciences, sociology, ethics, aesthetics, linguistics, education, political theories and views, philosophy, all possible images of the world and world outlooks, ideology and the ideological struggle. The extent of this influence confirms the great importance of Darwin's revolution in science. Ever since the publication of Darwin's "The Origin of Species" in 1859, every major representative not merely of the biological but of many other natural and social sciences and, frequently, outstanding political and state figures have deemed it necessary to express their attitude toward Darwinism. As a result, we are faced with an exceptional number of extremely varied and frequently conflicting and mutually exclusive views and

assessments of Darwinism which it would be practically impossible even to outline within an article. Therefore, we shall limit ourselves here to a consideration of the most important problem: the nature and philosophical significance of Darwin's revolution in biology.

Darwin's Theory of Evolution and Modern Biology

The question of the origin of the variety of forms of living matter on earth has long excited mankind. Gradually, two radically opposite concepts crystallized in the history of human thought: the creationist and the evolutionist. Despite the fact that these basic concepts are equally ancient, by virtue of the dominating role of the religious outlook until the second half of the 19th century, creationism and a metaphysical, i.e., nondialectical and antidialectical, view of nature predominated among scientists and philosophers. The tremendous majority of natural scientists proceeded from the acknowledgement of the irrefutable veracity of the biblical story of creation. Usually, siding with the great Swedish biologist Carl Linnaeus, they believed that the number of organic species was precisely the same in terms of species and numbers as those made by the "creator," i.e., that they were permanent.

The understanding of nature by even such dialectically and encyclopedically powerful people as Hegel "whose great merit," as Engels said, "is that he was the first to conceive of the entire natural, historical and spiritual world as a process, i.e., in a state of continuous motion, change, transformation and development, and to make an attempt to determine the inner links between this movement and development," remained essentially metaphysical. "Like the 18th century French, Hegel's concept of nature was that it was always an entity equal to itself, moving within the same limited circle, with eternal celestial bodies, as Newton claimed, and with permanent species of organic beings, as Linne taught...." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 20, p 24). Because of this Hegel excluded the possibility that animate matter can come out of inanimate matter and that new organic species may develop in the course of their progress.

Hegel was an idealist. His views on human history and knowledge were as idealistic as his dialectics--the dialectics of the absolute idea, the absolute spirit. By virtue of his idealism, Hegel neither discovered nor could discover the real dialectics not only of nature but of society, and the true laws governing their development. This historical task was carried out by Marx and Engels. It was only in the light of the revolutionary change they made that the true dimensions of Darwin's revolution in biology could be seen and understood. Darwin's great historical merit is that he provided a dialectical-materialistic interpretation of the evolution of the organic world, thus dealing a mortal blow to creationism and idealistic and religious views on animate nature.

Naturally, even prior to Darwin, the idea of evolution had had a number of supporters. Furthermore, together with Darwin, other scientists were progressing toward the same idea. They were his contemporaries, such as, for example, A. R. Wolles. Darwin knew and made use of the achievements of his predecessors and was familiar with their strong and weak sides. With a type

of honesty and conscientiousness worthy of his scientific genius and moral greatness, he started his epoch-making book "The Origin of Species" with a special "historical essay" in which he considered already existing views on this matter. In noting the historical merits of various scientists, Darwin emphasized the particular role of two among his predecessors--J. L. Buffon and J. B. Lamarck. The appearance of Darwin's theory of the evolution of organic species was prepared for the entire preceding development in the natural sciences, such as geology, archaeology, morphology, physiology, embryology, anatomy, and other philosophical thinking and social practices (as for example the tremendous experience which selectioneers had gained in animal husbandry and crop growing).

However, not one of Darwin's predecessors was able systematically to substantiate the evolutionary view on the organic world, defend it in the struggle against the dominating antievolutionary creationist positions, and apply it in the natural sciences as the exclusive scientific view on animate organisms and organic species.

Briefly, the basic stipulations of Darwin's theory of evolution are the following.

Organic species were not created supernaturally and are not permanent. Under certain circumstances, the lowest possible forms of animate matter appeared on our planet naturally, and were the beginning of the whole immeasurable variety of organic forms developed thanks to the laws of nature, laws which, according to Darwin, are still operating around us. "In the broadest meaning of the term, these laws involve growth and reproduction; heredity, which almost necessarily stems from reproduction; mutation, which depends on the direct or indirect action of living conditions or on exercise or lack of exercise; the progression of multiplication, which is so rapid as to lead to a struggle for existence and to its consequence--natural selection, which entails a differentiation of characteristics and the disappearance of less advanced forms. Therefore, this war raging in nature and hunger and death directly lead to the highest possible results we can imagine--the formation of superior forms of animal life."

It was thus that Darwin discovered and scientifically proved the law of the development of the organic world. He created a streamlined and scientifically substantiated dialectical-materialistic theory of the origin and evolution of organic matter. It was precisely thanks to this theory and with its help that creationist and, in general, antievolutionary, metaphysical and idealistic concepts were forced out of their dominating positions in the natural sciences and biology became a real science. This is the nature of the great revolution which Darwin made in biology. Consequently, it is entirely natural that following the publication of his work "The Origin of Species," evolutionary theory and Darwinism began to be considered interchangeable, and that the calendar of contemporary scientific biology begins with Darwin.

During the century which separates us from Darwin's death profound changes have taken place in biology, of truly epoch-making significance in terms of

its development. The first among them was the appearance of genetics, which marked the rediscovery of the laws of Gregor Mendel' in 1900; the second was the appearance and development of molecular biology and molecular genetics, arbitrarily considered as having been started in 1940. As we know, these two events, which determined the aspect of 20th century biology, took place in the field of study of heredity, to which Darwin ascribed key significance in his evolutionary theory. However, at that time the science of heredity did not exist as yet, with the exception of isolated speculative hypotheses. Generally speaking, unlike 19th century biology, which was based essentially on the observation and description of biological macroobjects and macro-processes, 20th century biology focuses on experimental studies of micro-objects, microstructures and microprocesses in the organic world.

Naturally, the following questions arise in such a situation. Does Darwin's theory of evolution find confirmation and further development in discoveries and achievements in 20th century biology and, particularly, in the discoveries and achievements of contemporary molecular biology and molecular genetics? Does it have any topical relevance in terms of contemporary biology or should it be considered as a long-obsolete stage in the historical development of biological science?

Most contemporary biologists consider the development of the organic world an irrefutable fact. All biological disciplines deal, to one degree or another, with the study of evolution. However, the theory of evolution exists also as an autonomous branch. Based on the achievements of all biological sciences, it studies the overall laws of the evolutionary process and is of great methodological significance in all biological disciplines. Knowledge of the laws governing the evolutionary process and the evolutionary approach to biological problems has a double methodological significance in the individual biological sciences. On the one hand, they enable us to understand quite profoundly any specific biological discipline, be it biochemistry, biophysics, genetics, morphology, zoology or botany. On the other hand, specialists in any biological field, be it botany, zoology, physiology, biochemistry, genetics or biogeocenology, must have a knowledge of the laws of evolution and the evolutionary approach to biological problems in order to be able successfully to resolve any major specialized problem. All theories and hypotheses in biology assume their logical completion only if they can satisfy the evolutionary principle. Such is the place, role and significance of the theory of evolution in contemporary biology.

However, despite the wide recognition of Darwin's theory of evolution by contemporary scientists, and despite the more than 120 years which have passed since his main work was completed, the revolution he accomplished in science is not a dormant volcano surrounded by peace, tranquility and quiet. Scientific arguments about the theory and the battle for Darwinism did not end with the 19th century even in terms of their basic aspects. It was precisely at the turn of the 20th century that this battle broke out with new strength. No single scientific theory with the exception of Marxism has been the object of such a lengthy and fierce struggle as Darwinism and, in the past 5-6 years, the struggle for and against Darwinism has become more widespread and fierce than it was when it appeared. This struggle, in the past

as in the present, is not purely scientific, conducted within biology, with the use of scientific ideas and means and exclusively inspired by scientific interests and objectives. On the contrary, it has a clearly expressed philosophical, ideological and even political nature.

Both in the past and today the campaign against Darwinism in many countries is headed by the numerous troops of religious obscurantism, joined with political reaction, occasionally using the most violent means of struggle. However, it is only in the United States that the courts have been used in the struggle against Darwin's theory of evolution.

In 1925, i.e., 66 years after the publication of Darwin's famous work "The Origin of Species," the famous "monkey trial" took place in the small American town of Dayton (Tennessee), as a result of which the American biology teacher D. Scopes was sentenced to pay a fine, solely because he taught the theory of evolution in school.

Following the trials organized by the medieval inquisition directed against the creators and disseminators of natural scientific theories which conflicted with religious dogma and religious outlook, trials which made it infamous forever, this was the first court trial of a natural science teacher in the history of mankind. Alas, it was not the last.

In mid-December 1981, a new trial began in federal court in the American city of Little Rock, the administrative center of the state of Arkansas. Here American religious obscurantism and political reaction put Darwin's theory and the contemporary theory of evolution in general on the defendants' stand. They were no longer trying a teacher or professor who had dared to present it but the theory itself.

The spectacle in Little Rock drew the attention of the world's scientific public as though it were a new edition of the "monkey trial" of 1925, and disturbed a number of people.

As was to be expected, the British scientific public could not fail to react to it. In its 3-9 December 1981 issue, NATURE, a natural science journal, tried to calm down and instill confidence in scientific circles. In its article "Tolerance But No Concessions to Creationism," it reported that last week "in his speech at a meeting of the Royal Society, Sir E. Huxley well defined the status of Darwinism as scientific theory." The journal deemed it necessary to reemphasize that "Darwinism has all the attributes of a mature and powerful scientific theory," whereas "creationism is not part of science but an alternative to it." By virtue of this fact the journal hoped that "the Arkansas trial would not be as dramatic as the judgment passed on Mr. John Scopes, the Tennessee biology teacher, 56 years ago."

Indeed, the past 50 years could not fail to amend the court sentence: the court did not dare to proclaim the theory of evolution "unscientific." It had to settle for a compromise: to proclaim creationism a "scientific theory" and to instruct the state schools to teach it. The Little Rock trial turned out to be the beginning of a chain of stereotype processes in a considerable

number of American states, the results of which were one and the same: granting the right to teach "creationist science" in 18 states in biology class along with Darwin's theory of evolution and proclaiming it to be as scientific as Darwin's theory. At the same time, pressure was applied on a number of textbook authors and some publishing houses to delete the word "evolution" from the books. Discussing the new trials in the United States, Jean-Pierre Gasc, deputy director of the French National Museum of the Natural Sciences, wrote: "We, the fellow citizens of Voltaire and Diderot, could laugh this off if we could forget the status of North American imperialism in the world."

Unfortunately, the anti-Darwin wave has also rolled over Western countries such as France, England, the FRG and others, although without "monkey trials" and judicial spectacles.

Thus, the French scientific journal LA RECHERCHE inaugurated the "Year of Darwin" with an article by Pierre Tuillier bearing the intriguing and equivocal title "Was Darwin a Darwinist?" in which the author claimed that Darwinism had undergone its own evolution to the point of total unrecognizability. The author thus questioned whether the contemporary theory of evolution is consistent with the basic precepts of Darwin's theory. The same thought was more clearly expressed by J. (Liapouge) in the newspaper LE MONDE. "The theory of natural selection," he writes, "itself became a victim of selection. Its strongest and most reliable parts may be cut off but it continues to live in the wormy branches which should be pruned. These defective branches are so numerous as to make us forget that we should note Darwin's second death one century after the first one."

The extensive dissemination of such claims regarding the historical fate of Darwinism in the Western press is also largely related to the unquenchable thirst for sensations to attract the attention of even the most apathetic reader. In any case, they disturb the broad mass of fellow citizens who are unfamiliar with the historical development and the current condition of the theory of evolution created by Darwin or the real attitude toward it of modern biology. In the final account, all of this provides grist for the mill of creationism, religious obscurantism, mysticism and idealism.

Naturally, today's theory of evolution is different from that of Darwin's time. Anything else would be peculiar. What kind of scientific, not to mention evolutionary, theory could it be if in the course of an entire century--a century of unparalleled revolutionary changes and accomplishments in science--it had not been amended, expanded, enriched and developed?! Let us also not forget that Darwin himself did not consider his theory complete and definitive, a complete interpretation of all problems related to the evolution of living organisms, tolerating no objections. He did not deny that "numerous and substantial objections exist to the theory of the origin of species through changes and natural selection," and that "anyone who tends to emphasize unresolved difficulties rather than accept the satisfactory interpretation of some facts" could reject his theory. However, pointing out the still-confused and unresolved problems and the numerous and serious objections, difficulties and prejudices which were encountered by his theory

of evolution, Darwin emphasized that he looked toward the future with confidence and predicted that his theory would open a field "for further and even more important studies," as a result of which "a great deal of light will be shed regarding the origin of man and his history."

The attitude of the Marxist classics toward Darwin's theory was consistent with the actual situation. "... The theory of development itself," Engels wrote, "is still too young, for which reason unquestionably further studies would substantially modify current concepts regarding the process of development of species, including the strictly Darwinist ones" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 20, p 75). At the same time, however, in defending Darwin's theory of evolution from Duhring's nihilistic attacks, Engels noted that "whatever transformations may await this theory in its particulars, as a whole it already now solves the problem more than satisfactorily. It essentially establishes the sequence of development of organisms from a few simple forms to an increasing variety of complex forms as we note today, ending with man" (ibid., p 512).

The predictions made by Darwin and Engels regarding the historical fate of the theory of evolution proved to be prophetic. What is amazing is not the fact that a great deal has changed in the field of classical Darwinism but the fact that its basic stipulations have passed the test of history, have been essentially preserved and have been developed further.

There is no way to trace within the limitations of an article the process of development of the theory of evolution from Darwin to its current state, frequently referred to as the "synthetic theory of evolution." This is not a universally accepted term in Marxist biological and philosophical literature. Regardless of the name given to the contemporary scientific theory of evolution or the current stage of development of evolutionary theory, however--such as "Darwinism," "modern Darwinism," "synthetic theory of evolution," "contemporary theory of evolution," "contemporary theory of microevolution" or "contemporary synthetic theory of evolution"--the authors using such concepts and terms invest them with the same basic meaning. All of them, Marxists and non-Marxists, unanimously agree that the contemporary theory of evolution is synthetic and is substantially different from the theory of evolution of classical Darwinism.

The evolutionary theory of classical Darwinism had no theory of heredity. The modern theory of evolution appeared as a result of a merger of Darwin's theory of evolution with Mendel's genetics. It already has its own genetic foundation and is developing mainly as a genetic-evolutionary theory.

The theory of evolution of classical Darwinism was a macroevolutionary theory. Furthermore, it used exclusively descriptive and comparative study methods. Its target was the macroevolutionary process, i.e., the evolutionary process of species, families, units, etc., which covered "large segments of time, vast territories and all (including higher) taxonomic living organisms as well as basic general and individual evolutionary phenomena" (N. V. Timofeyev-Resovskiy, N. N. Vorontsov and A. V. Yablokov, "Kratkiy Ocherk Teorii Evolyutsii" [Brief Essay on the Theory of Evolution]. Nauka,

Moscow, 1977, p 25). After Darwin, and particularly after the development of the contemporary theory of evolution, a large number of new and major successes were achieved in the field of macroevolutionary research through the contributions of scientists such as I. I. Schmalhausen, B. Rensch, J. H. Simpson, A. L. Takhtadzhyan, V. I. Vernadskiy and others, not only with the help of the classical methods of comparative anatomy, paleontology and embryology, but also the achievements of genetics, physiology, ecology, biochemistry and molecular biology. Furthermore, starting with the 1970s, problems of macroevolution once again became particularly topical in connection with the theories developed by N. Eldridge and St. Gould on the "intermittent balance" and the so-called "layerism" ("kladizm"). However, the main interest in the contemporary theory of evolution is focused not on macroevolution but on microevolution--on processes which cover a relatively short time segment, occur on a limited territory and include phenomena which take place in populations, i.e., in elementary evolutionary structures. These are evolutionary processes on the intraspecies level. Unlike the studies of macroevolutionary processes, the study of them can and does involve the use of experimental methods, while the microevolutionary phenomena themselves could be experimentally duplicated.

The modern theory of evolution is based on traditional biological sciences and their achievements and on the achievements of a number of new biological sciences, particularly important among which are population genetics, molecular biology and molecular genetics, the use of mathematical methods and principles of cybernetics and the theory of information in the study of evolution processes, and others. This has led to the development of a number of new directions in evolutionary research, such as "evolutionary mathematics," "evolutionary molecular biology," and others.

Generally speaking, the modern theory of evolution is incomparably richer in terms of theoretical content and problems. However, it remains that very same materialistic theory of evolution dealing with the origin and development of organic species through hereditary mutations and the struggle for survival and natural selection, advanced and enriched through the achievements of the entire large family of contemporary biological and many other sciences and human practice. It is precisely because of its systematic nature and proofs provided through the achievements of all the traditional and new biological sciences and the more advanced and more accurate methods of studying the organic world that the Darwinist theory of evolution is defeating its enemies and, as is universally acknowledged, is dominating contemporary biology.

Darwinism and Philosophy

If we try to answer the question of why it is that the struggle regarding Darwinism today, 100 years after Darwin's death, is not abating but is being waged with the same or even greater violence, we come across the question of the interrelationship between Darwinism and philosophy. What is the attitude of Darwinism toward philosophy and of philosophy toward Darwinism? It is noteworthy that here again, both among the representatives of the individual sciences as well as the philosophers, a great variety of opinions exists,

essentially based on the differences in the philosophical positions of their authors and their views concerning philosophy and its interrelationship with the individual sciences.

However great such differences may be, it is historically irrefutable that from the end of the 1850s to this day there has been no single significant philosophical current, scientific school or theory which has not been forced to define its attitude toward Darwin's theory of evolution. Some consider this theory as their ally, their support and even their natural scientific foundation or addition. This does not apply to the various materialistic philosophical theories alone. Even some supporters of religious philosophy have tried to adapt and to include Darwin's theory of evolution in their philosophical stock of knowledge (such as Teilhard de Chardin). Other currents have tried to develop Darwin's theory of evolution into a separate philosophy and integral outlook. Others again openly proclaimed their hostile attitude toward Darwinism, having been born and developed in a fierce struggle against it. Many of them, such as Bergson's "creative evolution," Drish's neovitalism, the "emergent evolution," or N. Hartman's critical ontology, appeared as idealistic or metaphysical alternatives to Darwin's evolutionism. The existence of such a broad, profound and deep influence by Darwin's theory on philosophy and its basic directions, schools of thought and currents is the most eloquent proof that all efforts to present this theory as having nothing to do with philosophy are simply absurd.

Naturally, Darwin's theory of evolution is biological rather than philosophical. Although we relate the concept of "evolution" to Darwin the way we relate the concept of "relativity" to Einstein, it is not even a theory of evolution in general but merely of evolution in animate nature, which is substantially different in terms of its laws, motive forces and mechanisms from evolution in inanimate nature and from the development of human society. It is precisely because of all of this that all efforts to convert Darwin's theory of evolution into philosophy and into an integral outlook, automatically applying its principles and laws in explaining inanimate nature or the history of human society and human knowledge, are unscientific and, in the realm of the social sciences, reactionary as well.

However, as a biological theory Darwin's theory of evolution has strong ties with philosophy and is of tremendous importance to philosophy. These ties are as follows.

First of all, despite the fact that today most representatives of the individual sciences frequently forget that philosophy is the mother of virtually all currently existing basic and individual sciences, theoretical biology until the time of Lamarck and even long after him was considered part of the "philosophical" sciences. Lamarck himself entitled his main work "Philosophy of Zoology." The roots of Darwin's theory of evolution also lie in philosophy, and may be traced to the philosophy of the ancient materialism of Anaximander, Heraclitus, Empedocles, Epicurus and Lucretius. Darwin's predecessors include great philosophers such as Liebnitz, Kant, Diderot, most of the materialists of the 18th and first half of the 19th centuries, Goethe, Spencer and others. In the same way that the atomism of modern times and

contemporary physics converted the atomistic theory of the ancient philosophers-materialists into a scientific theory, Darwin transformed the evolutionary ideas of his predecessors, from antiquity to the mid-19th century, into a scientific theory.

Secondly, undertaking the creation of his theory of evolution, Darwin was already a convinced supporter of materialistic philosophy. This was proved by the Americans Howard Gruber and Paul Barrett in the book "Darwin on Man" (1974) with a preface by the famous Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget. The authors not only undertook to provide a thorough study of Darwin's creative activities but were the first to publish his notes "On Man, Spirit and Materialism." These notes, as the authors note, are the key to understanding the essential role of Darwin's ideas on man and spirit in the process of his views on evolution and the great importance of his philosophical materialistic views in the substantiation of his theory. Howard Gruber and Paul Barrett try to explain the reasons for which for a long time Darwin held back the publication of the results of his studies. "His fear of persecution and ridicule," they conclude, "was based not only on the unpopularity of the theory of evolution but the fierce revenge taken on the supporters of materialism." According to the authors, Darwin's 1837-1839 notes provide "nearly daily information on the struggle which the young man had to fight to create a theory which became one of the great accomplishments in the progress of human thought" (Howard E. Gruber and Paul H. Barrett, "Darwin on Man," New York, 1974, p XIV).

Thus, Darwin's 22 July 1838 entry reads as follows: "In order to avoid explaining the extent to which I believe in materialism, let me merely say that hereditary feelings, instincts, and level of talent are such because the brain of the child resembles that of the parents" (ibid., p 276). "Why is it," Darwin asks, "that as a secretion of the brain thinking is a more amazing process than is gravity as the property of matter?" (p 451). The answers which we find in his notes are the following: "The spirit is a function of the body" (p 331). "Thinking ... can be hardly conceived of as anything other than the structure of the inherited brain." And, as if not to leave any doubt as to the materialistic nature of such views, Darwin exclaims: "Oh, you materialist!" (p 450).

Hence the conclusion that Darwin's biological theory, although it belongs to the natural sciences, has its philosophical coloring. Its creator was inspired by definite materialistic ideas (although not entirely free from some simplification), by which he was consciously guided in his research.

Thirdly, in addition to the reasons we mentioned, Darwin's theory of evolution inevitably leads to the formulation of basic philosophical problems by virtue of the profoundly fundamental and broad scope of his study of the organic world. Engaged in the consideration and scientific interpretation of problems of the origin of life, the unity and variety of the organic world, the origin and development of species, and the specific characteristics and laws governing the evolution of animate nature, unlike the evolution in inanimate nature and the history of human society, the development of its biological aspect under the conditions of sociohistorical reality, as well

as the significance of the theory of evolution in terms of science, philosophy and human culture in general, the evolutionist biologists inevitably fall back on basic philosophical problems and experience the need for philosophical concepts and categories. In turn, through the formulation of problems, studies and conclusions in their own fields of science, they contribute to the enrichment of philosophical knowledge. The entire history of the theory of evolution, from the moment of its appearance and to this day, is the irrefutable confirmation of its internal and organic ties with philosophy. The founders of Marxism considered Darwin's theory of evolution the natural scientific foundation of their philosophical views (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," vol 30, p 102).

It is precisely in the materialistic and dialectical nature of Darwin's theory of evolution that we find the answer to the question of why is it that all idealistic and metaphysical doctrines rose against it. In our time this struggle against Darwinism is being waged not only frontally, by the opponents of Darwinism who openly related to the struggle against Marxism, socialism and atheism, resorting to open accusations and objections. There also are other, more flexible tactics in fighting Darwinism--its revision and adaptation to a variety of idealistic and even religious views and systems. As with Marxism, such tactics become necessary to the opponents of Darwinism because of its successes and the consolidation of its positions in science. We know that even the Roman Catholic church was forced to resort to such tactics.

Such tactics are also frequently used when, on the one hand, everything possible is attempted to replace in the polemics against evolutionary theory arguments of a natural scientific order with ideological considerations and, on the other, to deprive the natural scientific conclusions, knowledge and concepts of their philosophical and conceptual significance. Today a large number of bourgeois biologists-Darwinists and philosophers are trying to pit Darwinism against Marxism. Such attempts follow several directions, which are usually closely interrelated and frequently convert one into another.

One such direction follows the path of pitting Darwin's evolutionism against Marxist dialectics as allegedly incompatible and mutually exclusive views on the development of animate nature. Over the past several years the British author L. B. Halstead has distinguished himself as being one of the most militant and loud supporters and propagandists of this concept. His view is noteworthy not because of any new and profound arguments he may cite in support of his thesis but his demonstration of a class vulgar-ideological approach to complex and important biological problems. Thus, Halstead supports the reformist (or gradualistic) interpretation of the evolutionary process only because of his effort to block any possibility of acknowledging a spasmodic leap wherever it may happen--in nature or society. "If one could prove," he writes, "that the form of evolution was spasmodic, the Marxists would indeed be able to claim that the theoretical foundation of their approach is supported by scientific proof." "The Marxist view of the history of life would then become the main subject in our country's educational system (i.e., in Britain--the author). Marxism would be able to draw

support from the scientific laws of history more confidently than ever before." Yet Halstead does not wish this to happen, for which reason he favors gradualism. Therefore, his approach to the problems of the theory of evolution is one more confirmation of Lenin's thought to the effect that the ideologues of the exploiting classes would argue even against geometric axioms were the latter to conflict with their interests.

The second direction tries to present Darwinism as a purely scientific theory, entirely rejecting its connection with materialistic philosophical views. Of late, Gunther Altner, a West German author, has been the representative of this direction. In his 1981 book "Darwinism," he claims that Darwin "was no materialist" or atheist at all. As a "model agnostic," who considered "the question of God unresolved," Darwin allegedly opposed any attempt at relating his theory of evolution to materialism and atheism. In the past such claims could be accepted to one extent or another even by some scientific circles. In 1981, however, their support can be explained either by the lack of information of the author himself or his reliance on the ignorance of the readers. Darwin's "The Origin of Species" and "Autobiography" include a great deal of proof of his materialistic and atheistic views. The publication of his notes of the 1830s, which took place in 1974, made totally groundless and flimsy any attempt to deny Darwin's materialistic and atheistic way of thinking.

Unlike authors such as Altner, supporters of a third direction try to extend the principles of Darwin's theory of evolution beyond biology or animate nature, to the realms of politics, sociology, ethics and other social sciences. A so-called "sociobiology" even appeared in the 1970s. Like any other effort to supplant Darwinism in the realm of human sociohistorical life, it was used as an ideological weapon to protect the bourgeois system. Harvard University zoology professor Edward O. Wilson, who published his "Sociobiology. A New Synthesis," in 1975, is considered its author. In the final account, the use of biological laws in the field of social relations, in which qualitatively different laws operate, discredits the natural-historical knowledge itself. Therefore, "sociobiology" itself is a weapon in the struggle against Darwinism.

It was approximately during that time that the "evolutionary theory of knowledge" appeared. Carefully considered, it could hardly be described as a unified theory. Its supporters are united only by their wish to develop a certain theory of knowledge based on the achievements of contemporary biology, psychology and linguistics. In reality, however, the various supporters of the "evolutionary theory of knowledge" are under the influence of a variety of traditional or contemporary bourgeois philosophical doctrines, such as Kantianism, N. Hartman's critical ontology, K. Popper's "Critical Rationalism," and others. Thus, for example, joining D. Campbell, K. Lorenz describes his "evolutionary theory of knowledge" as "hypothetical realism." However, in addition to D. Campbell's philosophical views, its ideological sources can be found in Kant, Buhler, Popper, and even Monot. He rejects the idealistic view that "the external world exists not independently of the mind but only as a subject of possible experience." Together with Monot he accepts as the "basic support of the scientific method the so-called

"postulate of the objectiveness of nature." Despite this, and despite the fact that we find in Lorenz a great deal of powerful and convincingly written criticism of idealism, he considers the objective reality of nature and the outside world as a necessary hypothesis but a hypothesis nevertheless. That is precisely why his realism is known as "hypothetical."

The "evolutionary theory of knowledge" in all its varieties deserves serious critical analysis from the viewpoint of Marxist positions, for it tries to base itself on contemporary biology, psychology and linguistics and the contemporary theory of evolution and, on their behalf, to present itself as something new in philosophy which opposes dialectical materialism. The Marxists should not fail to pay attention to such efforts. Here again we find entirely justifiable Lenin's stipulation that "without a solid philosophical substantiation no natural sciences, and no materialism could withstand the struggle against the pressure of bourgeois ideas and the restoration of a bourgeois outlook" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 45, pp 29-30). For this reason we cannot agree with Robert Young's viewpoint, expressed in the article "The Discussion on Darwin," in the April 1982 issue of the journal MARXISM TODAY. The author writes that the Marxists should not take any side in the contemporary argument taking place between Darwinist biologists and creationists. We believe that by its very nature Marxism, more than any other theory, should participate in the struggle for the dissemination of Darwinism and defense of it against creationism, religious obscurantism, idealism and metaphysics.

The centennial anniversary of Darwin's death is an occasion for recalling one of the greatest victories and conquests of the human mind, human knowledge, science, materialism, dialectics, revolutionary daring and the revolutionary rise of scientific thinking above religious obscurantism, idealism and metaphysics--a victory and an advance inspired by love for scientific truth and the aspiration to put science in the service of mankind and social progress. This date is and must be the result of a century of scientific achievements in the unraveling of new secrets in animate nature, achievements not aimed at destruction and death but contributing to the triumph of life over death and to the joy and happiness of all people.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

A QUARTER-CENTURY OF THE SPACE AGE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 49-59

[Article by Doctor of Technical Sciences, Twice Hero of the Soviet Union
A. Yelisseyev, pilot-cosmonaut of the USSR]

[Text] The fourth day of October marked the 25th anniversary of the launching of the world's first artificial satellite. That day has been entered for all time in the calendar of the most outstanding historical dates. It marked the beginning of mankind's space age. We are proud that it was our country, the motherland of Great October, that had the honor of opening that age.

"It is a great victory for mankind, a turning point in the history of civilization," wrote Frederic Joliot-Curie at that time. "Man is no longer shackled to his planet..."

The prerequisites for it were the well-known social and economic transformations in our society, our successful industrialization, and scientific and technological advancement achieved by our heroic people, who are now preparing to celebrate the glorious 60th anniversary of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The theoretical foundations of cosmonautics were laid down by our illustrious countryman Konstantin Eduardovich Tsiolkovskiy. The 125th anniversary of his birth was recently celebrated by the public at large both in this country and abroad. It is a thrill to leaf through his works today--in them the daring of inspired dreams goes hand in hand with sober mathematical calculation and meticulous experiments. They embody an integrated program of space exploration, a brilliant forecast not only of the birth of a new branch of science and technology but also, in a certain sense, the perspectives of mankind's development: as the great man of Kaluga wrote, "man will not remain forever on earth but, in pursuit of light and space, at first tentatively, penetrate beyond the atmosphere and then take possession of the solar system." This era of exploration was launched by our people, whose creative energy and genuinely revolutionary spirit are striving toward communism.

The success of the first flight of a man-made earth satellite demonstrated that Soviet specialists had found the correct ways to resolve such problems as the selection of the structural design layout and the building of rocket engines, control and automation systems for the boosters, and flight

ballistics. The second satellite, which was launched into orbit on 3 November 1957, carried out the first biological experiments in space, also research into cosmic rays and short-wave solar radiation.

On 10 December 1957, when two Soviet satellites were circling the earth, PRAVDA published an article by Sergey Pavlovich Korolev. In it the chief designer of space rocket systems wrote: "The two terrestrial stars launched by the mighty hand of the Soviet people are hurtling around the earth and giving incontrovertible proof of the magnificent accomplishments of the socialist system, of Soviet science, technology, and culture."

The birth of Soviet space exploration constituted a brilliant demonstration of the country's high scientific-technical potential. At the same time, starting with the very first flight, all work relating to space exploration in this country has continued to serve the interests of further scientific, technical, and economic development.

Space flights opened up radically new possibilities for carrying out a broad range of scientific research and for implementing efforts of importance to the national economy.

The innovative character of these possibilities is based on several factors. The flights are carried out at great altitudes, making it possible to make global observations of the earth's surface and atmosphere. All areas of the earth become accessible. Spacecraft make it possible to study areas that are undeveloped and difficult to get to. In addition, they make it possible to observe large-scale objects such as big geological formations, ocean currents, clouds, and so on. Since spacecraft circling the earth regularly fly over the same areas, they can be used to study the dynamics of processes taking place on the earth's surface or in the atmosphere. These factors are very useful in handling many tasks, and for this reason space exploration immediately attracted the attention of specialists in a variety of fields--geologists, hydrologists, meteorologists, workers in the fishing industry, forestry, agriculture, and so on.

Workers in communications were the earliest to put spacecraft to work in daily life. They made use of the fact that a spacecraft high above the earth can be seen simultaneously from various regions of the globe separated by thousands of kilometers. This means that by installing a relay on such a craft it is possible to provide wireless communications over a very large area. And so the first communications satellite--Molniya-1--appeared in April 1965. Later on it served as the basis for the creation of the Orbita communications satellite system. It is used to broadcast central television and radio programs, telephone and telegraph, telephotos, and central newspaper matrices. At present there are more than 90 Orbita ground distribution stations in the Soviet Union. Similar stations have also been built in many socialist countries.

In recent years a new communications satellite system--Moskva--has begun to function alongside the Orbita system; it uses the Gorizont and Ekran satellites. The Ekran system makes it possible to transmit television broadcasts

to small collective antennas installed on rooftops. It has come into widespread use in the small population centers of Siberia and the Far North. At present more than two-thirds of Soviet television viewers can watch broadcasts relayed by satellite.

Another example of the effective use of spacecraft in the interests of the national economy is the meteor satellite weather system.

As we know, meteorology involves the study of the atmosphere. It studies the laws governing atmospheric processes and looks for connections between these processes and such natural phenomena as variations in solar activity, changes in temperature conditions of the seas and oceans, earthquakes, volcano eruptions, and so on. In addition, meteorology gathers information about the actual atmospheric conditions and, on this basis, taking account of known laws, compiles weather forecasts.

The most time-consuming aspect of the weather service has always been the collection of information about current weather conditions. Data of this kind must come in from numerous stations located more or less uniformly over the earth's surface. It must be kept in mind, however, that the seas and oceans make up almost three-quarters of the earth's surface, and there are many inaccessible regions on dry land. These circumstances once made it necessary to use thousands of airplanes and ships to gather weather information. The use of satellites has greatly simplified the task. Instruments installed in them make it possible to conduct observations over practically all of the planet's surface and routinely centralize the collection of data.

The Meteor space system, which includes satellites and a ground-based complex for the reception, processing, and dissemination of data, was created in 1967. Now its data are utilized in all sectors of the national economy. The system makes it possible to provide airplane and ship crews with timely information about weather conditions on their routes and make recommendations on the best course to take. It makes it possible to systematically monitor the state of the ice cover and evaluate weather conditions for opening navigation. Data coming in from this system are used in the day-to-day planning of work in agriculture, construction, transport, and so on.

Excellent prospects are afforded by the use of orbital spacecraft to study the earth's oceans. Interest in such studies is based on the fact that the ocean is an abundant source of water, foodstuffs, and mineral resources. Scientists are striving to assess the resources of the oceans and work out regulations governing ocean exploitation to prevent their depletion.

At the present time, space oceanology is just coming into being. But many experiments have already been carried out, using a large number of satellites, and very encouraging results have been achieved. It has been found, for example, that space techniques can be used to study ocean currents and the water's thermal conditions, to determine zones of high biological productivity, to detect contamination of the water by oil and industrial wastes, to map shallow-water regions, and so on. All of this indicates that efforts along these lines must be continued.

In recent years, spacecraft have come to be used in geology--they can be used to pick out areas having good prospects of petroleum, gas, and other minerals. This kind of prospecting can be carried out much more rapidly and at less cost than by traditional methods, and has already yielded excellent results.

A large proportion of space exploration now is devoted to land studies. Here the main focus is on the development of instruments and techniques for routine monitoring of soil and vegetation conditions. The organization of this kind of monitoring will make it possible to find much more effective ways to handle many tasks in forestry, agriculture, and environmental protection. Analysis has shown that space spectrozonal photographs can help detect types of vegetation, distinguish diseased from healthy vegetation, evaluate the conditions of pastures and farm crops, reveal damage to crops by drought, floods, fires, and so on. These photographs contain information about the temperature, moisture content, mechanical structure, and salinity of the soil cover, and can therefore serve as a means of finding territories that are suitable for development. It must be pointed out, however, that we have a long way to go before widespread adoption of space-monitoring techniques in economic practice. And one of the major tasks in this effort is the creation of ground-based systems for the automated processing and dissemination of data.

One important feature of space flight is that it goes beyond the boundaries of the atmosphere. This is of enormous importance to astronomers. As we know, the atmosphere absorbs a large portion of the radiation coming from space. And it is this radiation which contains information we need about the structure and evolution of the universe. It follows, obviously, that astronomical observations carried out in flights beyond the atmosphere can provide substantially better results.

Since ancient times, man has striven to learn as much as possible about the world in which he lives, how life came to be on earth, whether there are other civilizations in the universe, and whether there might be as yet unknown laws of nature there which could be put to the service of mankind. This striving, and the newly opened-up possibilities, account for the rapid development of space astrophysics. In the past quarter-century our country has developed a large number of instruments which together make it possible to record radiation in practically the entire range of wavelengths. These instruments have been placed in many spacecraft. They have made it possible to obtain new astrophysical data in amounts which probably exceed everything that was accumulated by centuries of optical astronomy. In many cases, very interesting natural phenomena have been discovered. Consider, for example, the discovery of earth's radiation belts--regions in which the planet's magnetic field retains high-energy charged particles. Discreet sources of X-ray radiation have also been detected. X-ray and gamma radiation of interstellar gas have also been recorded. It has been found that optical solar flares are accompanied by powerful bursts of X-rays.

Extremely interesting results have been obtained through flights of automatic spacecraft to the moon and the nearby planets of the solar system. In

January 1959, a little over 1 year after the launching of the first earth satellite, the automatic Luna-1 automatic spacecraft was sent to the moon carrying a set of scientific instruments. In October of that year the Luna-3 spacecraft was used to photograph the back side of the moon. The film was automatically exposed on board the spacecraft, and then the image was transmitted to earth via a television system. For the first time, people could see that portion of the moon's surface which is never turned toward the earth.

In 1966, for the first time in the history of space exploration, the Luna-9 spacecraft made a soft landing on the moon. It provided the first data concerning the structure and density of the moon's surface, and experimentally confirmed the possibility of making studies directly on the surface of the moon. For purposes of obtaining more detailed information about the characteristics of the moon's ground and collecting data on its microrelief, the Soviet Union built two mobile scientific laboratories called Lunokhods. In 1970 and 1973 they were landed in different regions of the moon and, responding to commands transmitted from earth's control center, they were moved about the moon's surface. The instruments aboard the Lunokhods transmitted television pictures of the surface, measured the physical-mechanical parameters of the ground, made a chemical analysis, measured the moon's magnetic field, and recorded cosmic radiation. The Lunokhods traveled a total of about 50 kilometers and transmitted to earth a large amount of unique scientific data.

In 1970-1976, three Soviet automatic spacecraft--the Luna-16, Luna-20, and Luna-24--brought back to earth samples of moon rock taken from various regions and various depths. These samples were studied in detail by scientists from many countries. The results of studying the samples and the data obtained by means of the Lunokhods have made it possible to construct a reasonable hypothesis concerning the history and evolution of the moon.

Launches of spacecraft to the moon were of exceptional technical as well as scientific significance. They made it possible to work out many techniques and means for future long-distance flights. Thanks to them it became possible to undertake the systematic exploration of solar system planets in a relatively short time. Since 1961 there have been regular flights of Soviet automatic spacecraft to Venus, and since 1962 to Mars. Soviet spacecraft were the first to accomplish soft landings on these planets. Thanks to flights of interplanetary spacecraft we have seen panoramic views of the planets' surfaces and obtained data concerning their ground structure, atmosphere, and magnetic fields. We have found, for example, that Venus has a very dense atmosphere consisting chiefly of carbon dioxide; that the pressure at the surface is about 90 atmospheres, while the temperature is about 500 degrees C. On Mars, on the other hand, pressure is hundreds of times lower than on earth.

Obviously, this kind of data substantially augments our knowledge about the universe. At the same time, however, this knowledge confronts scientists with more and more new questions and encourages further deepening and expansion of astrophysical observations.

January 1959, a little over 1 year after the launching of the first earth satellite, the Luna-1 automatic spacecraft was sent to the moon carrying a set of scientific instruments. In October of that year the Luna-3 spacecraft was used to photograph the back side of the moon. The film was automatically exposed on board the spacecraft, and then the image was transmitted to earth via a television system. For the first time, people could see that portion of the moon's surface which is never turned toward the earth.

In 1966, for the first time in the history of space exploration, the Luna-9 spacecraft made a soft landing on the moon. It provided the first data concerning the structure and density of the moon's surface, and experimentally confirmed the possibility of making studies directly on the surface of the moon. For purposes of obtaining more detailed information about the characteristics of the moon's ground and collecting data on its microrelief, the Soviet Union built two mobile scientific laboratories called Lunokhods. In 1970 and 1973 they were landed in different regions of the moon and, responding to commands transmitted from earth's control center, they were moved about the moon's surface. The instruments aboard the Lunokhods transmitted television pictures of the surface, measured the physical-mechanical parameters of the ground, made a chemical analysis, measured the moon's magnetic field, and recorded cosmic radiation. The Lunokhods traveled a total of about 50 kilometers and transmitted to earth a large amount of unique scientific data.

In 1970-1976, three Soviet automatic spacecraft--the Luna-16, Luna-20, and Luna-24--brought back to earth samples of moon rock taken from various regions and various depths. These samples were studied in detail by scientists from many countries. The results of studying the samples and the data obtained by means of the Lunokhods have made it possible to construct a reasonable hypothesis concerning the history and evolution of the moon.

Launches of spacecraft to the moon were of exceptional technical as well as scientific significance. They made it possible to work out many techniques and means for future long-distance flights. Thanks to them it became possible to undertake the systematic exploration of solar system planets in a relatively short time. Since 1961 there have been regular flights of Soviet automatic spacecraft to Venus, and since 1962 to Mars. Soviet spacecraft were the first to accomplish soft landings on these planets. Thanks to flights of interplanetary spacecraft we have seen panoramic views of the planets' surfaces and obtained data concerning their ground structure, atmosphere, and magnetic fields. We have found, for example, that Venus has a very dense atmosphere consisting chiefly of carbon dioxide; that the pressure at the surface is about 90 atmospheres, while the temperature is about 500 degrees C. On Mars, on the other hand, pressure is hundreds of times lower than on earth.

Obviously, this kind of data substantially augments our knowledge about the universe. At the same time, however, this knowledge confronts scientists with more and more new questions and encourages further deepening and expansion of astrophysical observations.

Among the various new lines of research involved in space exploration, considerable interest is evoked by space technology. Its development derives chiefly from the fact that the flight of a spacecraft is accompanied by unique factors such as weightlessness and deep vacuum. Each of these factors exerts its own effect on the occurrence of physical-chemical processes and, for this reason, can be used to produce materials having new properties.

In weightlessness, buoyancy force, which causes the light and heavy components in a mixture of liquids to group on different levels, is absent and natural convection, which causes mixing of liquids of different temperatures, is much weakened. Thanks to these factors, on board a spacecraft it is possible to obtain uniform mixtures of liquids of differing specific densities. On this basis, through heating and cooling it is possible to produce new solid compounds, and there is reason to hope that given a particular combination of components the compounds thus obtained should possess improved mechanical, electrical, thermal, and optical characteristics.

Outer vacuum can serve in the purification of materials. If a container in which melting and hardening of a material is carried out is connected with the space outside, space itself will serve the functions of an ideal pump which can be used to remove gaseous impurities. At present, work relating to the production of new materials is proceeding on a broad front, and specialists hope for results which will be of vital practical importance. Major attention in this is probably focused on the problem of obtaining high-quality semiconductor monocrystals for promising electronic and laser instruments.

Another task of space technology is the development of techniques and means for carrying out assembly work in space relating to the development of large structures of the future, huge orbital stations, energy plants, and so forth, also carrying out repairs in the technical maintenance of spacecraft. These and other kinds of work may require such operations as welding, soldering, cutting, drilling, connecting threaded pairs, and so on. To prepare for them it is necessary to study beforehand the nature of each technological process and test the equipment. Much attention is being focused on these matters in our space programs, and outstanding achievements have been made.

In 1969, during the flight of Soyuz-6, the first successful experiments were carried out in the electric welding of steel and aluminum samples, also electron-ray cutting of metals. Orbital stations of the Salyut type have performed many experiments on the application of coatings to various surfaces and the shaping of products made of polyurethane foam. Considerable positive experience has been accumulated in carrying out actual repairs, using soldering, cutting, the application of coatings, and complicated assembly and disassembly operations.

In listing the main directions of today's space exploration, finally, we cannot fail to consider medical-biological research. Its main aim is to find conditions in which humans' stays in space will not be detrimental to health. Conditions on board a spacecraft are substantially different from those on earth. Cosmonauts are subjected to weightlessness. They live in cramped

quarters and are isolated from the outside world. All of this exerts appreciable influences on the various structures of the organism. Scientists are comprehensively studying the nature of these influences and the organism's reactions to them and working out measures designed to ensure safety during these flights. Soviet science places obvious priority on this. Thanks to its achievements, our country has carried out the longest space expeditions.

In addition to protecting people's health, medical-biological research aims at resolving a number of applied tasks. For example, space life support systems are being tested experimentally, and the possibility of making new medical compounds during space flights is being studied. In addition, many projects are being implemented in the interests of fundamental science.

In the past 25 years the Soviet Union has launched about 1,500 spacecraft for various purposes. Most of these vehicles are automatic. They are simpler and considerably cheaper than manned spacecraft. Such flights require much simpler preparation. In cases where the project's procedures can be determined completely beforehand, therefore, preference is given to automatic spacecraft. At present most of the research and work designed for economic purposes are being carried out by means of them.

There are tasks, nevertheless, for which automated craft cannot satisfactorily substitute for humans. Often it is extremely desirable to carry out visual observations, interpret their results, and be able to record a phenomenon or object seen for the first time. Humans must fly in space to carry out research requiring a creative approach, to test procedures of new research. Human participation, obviously, is required for the assembly of huge structures in orbit. And it is quite likely that humans will perform preventive maintenance on future long-term unmanned spacecraft. And, besides, man will always strive to see the universe around the earth with his own eyes and penetrate as far as possible into the depths of space. In other words, present-day exploration of space is inconceivable without the direct participation of human beings. But this participation requires the resolution of many difficult scientific-technical problems. In this effort, Soviet space science has gone a long way and achieved a number of brilliant successes.

Efforts to design the first manned spacecraft, Vostok, were undertaken in our country in the late 1950s. At that time it was necessary to accomplish a large number of radically new tasks relating to the unique conditions of the upcoming flight. The great distance from earth, the high speed of the flight, the outer vacuum, weightlessness, exposed solar radiation, and streams of micrometeorites--all of these imposed special demands both on the design of the spacecraft and its on-board equipment.

Man's first space flight took place on 12 April 1961. It was one of the greatest events in space exploration. Successful completion of the flight constituted a brilliant demonstration of the magnificence of human reason, and we are proud of the fact that this accomplishment belongs to our Soviet people.

Yuriy Gagarin's flight answered one of the most important questions: he demonstrated that man can live and work in a spacecraft. This made it possible to move forward. Also in 1961, German Titov successfully completed a 24-hour flight on board the Vostok-2, and in 1962-63, Pavel Popovich, Andrian Nikolayev, and Valeriy Bykovskiy completed 3-day, 4-day, and 5-day flights on board the Vostok-3, Vostok-4, and Vostok-5, respectively. In these flights they obtained more detailed information about the cosmonauts' state of health, characteristics of working, resting, eating, and sleeping during flight, and carried out the first experiments on observing and photographing the earth from space.

Valentina Tereshkova, the first woman cosmonaut, flew in space on board Vostok-6 in 1963. As a result of the flight, doctors were confirmed in their belief that the female organism is just as capable as the male of coping with conditions in space.

The Vostok flights were the first steps in manned space exploration, but they already demonstrated convincingly that man's direct participation in work carried out on board could yield considerable benefits in resolving many scientific and economic tasks.

An analysis of the nature of the cosmonauts' forthcoming activities indicated that in order to achieve high effectiveness the size of the crew needed to be increased. In order to gain experience in carrying out multiple-manned space flights, a new three-man spacecraft, the Voskhod, was built in 1964, based on the Vostok. The Voskhod was more sophisticated. In particular, it incorporated a soft-landing system for the first time. The flight of the Voskhod, with three cosmonauts aboard, took place in October 1964 and was successful.

The next question of interest to specialists was whether it would be possible for humans to go outside the spacecraft into open space. Naturally, account was taken of the fact that the cosmonaut would have to have individual means of protection against the vacuum and radiation. It was obvious that it might be very desirable and in some situations vitally essential for the man to come out of the ship. It might be necessary to perform repair work outside, to assemble large structures, to transfer from one spacecraft to another, and so on. But it was unclear whether man could overcome one more psychological barrier and leave the ship, whether he could orient himself in open space, and what equipment needed to be designed for his work outside the spacecraft. The first answer to these questions came in 1965 during the flight of Voskhod-2 carrying cosmonauts Pavel Belyayev and Aleksey Leonov. Preparations for the Voskhod-2 flight required the resolution of a number of new and complicated technical tasks. It was necessary to build an airlock with a lock-through system, special space suits, individual portable life-support systems, a means of attaching the cosmonaut to the surface of the spacecraft, and other equipment. And so, on 18 March 1965, cosmonaut Aleksey Leonov emerged from the vehicle into outer space. He was in free flight for 12 minutes, during which time he repeatedly left the side of the vehicle, changed his position in space, and again returned to the exit hatch. Thus it was demonstrated that it is possible to work outside the spacecraft, and it confirmed the correctness of the basic engineering decisions that made it possible to emerge into open space.

Thus, 1965 witnessed the accumulation of a substantial amount of data on what kind of work man can perform in space and how the work can be supported. By that time, spacecraft of the Vostok and Voskhod type had accomplished their missions, and our country undertook to design a new space vehicle, the Soyuz.

The Soyuz was designed to carry out a broader program of research both during autonomous flight and when docking with other space vehicles. For this reason, extensive facilities were built in for controlling movement, carrying out research work, and providing for the crew's life support. The craft allowed the installation of large-sized scientific instruments, solar batteries, a docking unit, airlock facilities, and other equipment depending on the specific tasks of the flight. For low-traction engines, liquid fuel was used for the first time, making control considerably more economical. On reentry, the craft could make a glide descent into the atmosphere. This made it possible to increase the accuracy of the landing and reduce overloads during reentry.

Manned flights aboard the Soyuz were started in 1967. During the first stage they were devoted chiefly to the testing of on-board systems. Autonomous and group flights checked out all vehicle control conditions, carried out docking of two ships in orbit, and allowed cosmonauts to leave the vehicles and to cross open space from one craft to the other. After experimental confirmation of the projected characteristics, the spacecraft began to be used to carry out targeted missions.

The year 1971 witnessed a major event in Soviet space exploration--the first Salyut manned orbital station was built. Since that time, Soyuz spacecraft have been used regularly to transport crews to and from the station.

A space station is distinguished in principle from a space vehicle in that its flight does not end after the crew has finished its work, and the equipment can be utilized repeatedly. This makes it possible to substantially reduce the total material costs involved in the manufacture of spacecraft and their placement in orbit. In addition, because the station does not include the means of returning the crew to the earth, it has more room for the placement of scientific instruments and service equipment.

Obviously, the creation of space stations required solutions to a number of new technical problems. The fact is that the effectiveness of their use increases the longer they are in operation. It was necessary, therefore, to develop on-board equipment with a longer service life than that of a space vehicle. It was necessary to provide the possibility of carrying out diagnostic and repair and rehabilitation work during flights. And it was necessary, finally, to provide regular deliveries of fuel, water, food, movie film, and other expendable materials.

A new approach was also needed to the problem of the cosmonauts' living conditions aboard the station. Since it was desirable to extend the crews' stay on board, it was necessary to create the most comfortable conditions possible--that is, to equip convenient workplaces and areas for eating, resting, and physical exercise. It was necessary to provide effective

facilities for leisure, the possibility of hydrotherapeutic procedures, to design instruments for thorough medical monitoring, to equip the station with a waste ejection system, and so on.

One of the most complicated tasks was that of delivering cargo to the space station. To handle it satisfactorily, the special Progress cargo vehicle was built on the basis of the Soyuz.

At the present time the cosmonauts' space-station work is the main effort in the manned flight program. It is conducted on many planes. The cosmonauts carry out astronomical observations in different wavelength ranges, study the structure of the upper atmosphere, take part in prospecting for minerals, carry out numerous experiments in the production of new materials, and conduct research in fields of space biology and medicine. They work in close collaboration with scientists in the Flight Control Center. They consult routinely with specialists on perfecting procedures of conducting experiments and observations. When necessary, new research instruments can be delivered to the space station.

Thanks to the successes achieved by medical scientists and designers of spacecraft, manned flights of considerable duration are now carried out regularly. This is of vital significance. The fact is that in order to carry out complicated research successfully it is necessary to acquire practical experience, and that does not come easily. And there is another circumstance. During the analysis of the findings of observations and recordings back on earth, various questions periodically arise. To answer them it is frequently necessary to consult with the crew while it is on board. Sometimes it is necessary to repeat an operation or do it under different conditions. For such work it is very desirable to deal with the same crew each time.

One of the outstanding achievements of Soviet space research was the successful implementation of the unprecedentedly complex flight program of the Salyut-6 orbital station. The station functioned actively in orbit for almost 5 years. Cosmonauts worked on it about 2 years: the research program was carried out by 16 expeditions of 96, 140, 175, and 185 days' duration. Twelve cargo vehicles took turns delivering fuel, water, food, movie film, and new scientific instruments. In some categories, the amount of work completed in the station exceeds everything done in all preceding years.

Now a new Salyut-7 space station is in orbit. It is considerably more sophisticated than its predecessor. A crew of cosmonauts carrying out a sophisticated new program has been working in the station since 14 May.

In 1980, Soyuz-T transport ships replaced the Soyuz vehicles. These are new-generation spacecraft. The central component of their control system is a digital computer complex. It provides a substantially greater number of control modes and considerable economy, automatically monitors the state of the on-board equipment, and in visual form presents on the screen information about the results of its operation. The spacecraft is equipped with a new propulsion system and improved life support and radio communications systems. Its reentry apparatus provides greater accuracy in descent.

Orbital complex flights, which include space stations as well as manned transport and cargo vehicles, play a vital role in the development of fundamental sciences about the earth and the universe and in resolving many tasks of an economic nature. This is why our country will continue to attach priority significance to such flights.

Speaking about manned flights, special mention must be made of the cosmonauts' work. Today their profession is a very crucial and complicated one. Cosmonauts must be able to pilot a vehicle and a space station, to repair and replace equipment, and carry out numerous experiments of quite diverse content. No matter how perfected today's space stations may be, conditions aboard them differ greatly from those on earth. For this reason, space flight demands of the cosmonaut considerable mastery, dedication to his job, and, of course, great bravery.

The Soviet Union considers the exploration of space to be of vital interest to all mankind. Soon after the first man-made earth satellite was launched, the USSR submitted for discussion at the 13th UN General Assembly Session a proposal to draw up international agreements calling for collaboration of all countries in exploring and utilizing outer space. In 1967, at the initiative of the Soviet government, the Interkosmos program of collaboration of the socialist countries was adopted, calling for the joint implementation of all types of space exploration and broad contacts among scientists and specialists. Since 1968, satellites of the Kosmos and Interkosmos series have regularly carried out projects in accordance with this program involving the study of the physical properties of outer space and the upper atmosphere, solar research, and tasks of meteorology, communications, and biology.

A major event in the development of the Interkosmos program was a conference of delegations of the participating countries in Moscow in 1976. At the suggestion of the Soviet Union, the conference passed a resolution concerning flights with international crews made up of citizens of the socialist countries on board Soviet space vehicles and stations. In order to further expand and enhance space research, scientists of the socialist countries were offered the opportunity to submit their own experiments to be carried out in flight. Joint manned flights took place in 1978-1981. They were participated in by cosmonauts and researchers from Czechoslovakia, Poland, the GDR, Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, Cuba, Mongolia, and Romania. Instruments developed in the socialist countries were used to carry out a series of geophysical, technological, and medical-biological experiments; much new and valuable scientific data were obtained.

In 1962 the USSR Academy of Sciences concluded an agreement with the United States National Aeronautics and Space Administration on collaboration. This collaborative program included projects relating to the study of earth and near space, exploration of the moon and the planets of the solar system, work in the field of space meteorology, and space biology and medicine. In 1972 the USSR and the United States concluded an intergovernmental agreement on collaboration in space exploration for peaceful purposes. This agreement, in particular, called for efforts to design compatible means of rendezvous and docking of Soviet and American spacecraft and stations for purposes of

enhancing manned space flight safety and providing opportunities for conducting joint scientific experiments. For experimental testing of compatible systems it was decided to carry out a joint flight with the Soviet Soyuz spacecraft and the American Apollo. This flight was successfully carried out in July 1975. For the first time in the history of space exploration a space system consisting of vehicles from different countries with an international crew on board was put together in orbit and functioned for 2 days. The preparation and realization of this flight demonstrated the principled possibility of carrying out complicated international programs and made it possible to acquire valuable experience in collaboration working with such programs.

Since 1966, the Soviet Union has conducted broad collaboration in space research with France. For example, French research satellites have been launched into earth orbits by means of Soviet rockets. Soviet and French specialists collaborated on the design of scientific instruments placed aboard Venera interplanetary space stations. Apparatus manufactured in France has been placed on board Soviet Mars stations and on Lunokhods. More than 3 months ago, finally, an international Soviet-French crew made a space flight. Its participants--two Soviets and one Frenchman--successfully carried out on board the Salyut-7 space station an extremely intensive program of scientific research prepared by scientists of the two countries.

Our country is also carrying out joint space research with India, Sweden, and Austria.

The experience of broad international collaboration shows that combining the efforts of different countries makes it possible to substantially enhance the effectiveness of work in space, and makes a contribution to peaceful relations between countries.

In his message to the Second United Nations Conference on the Exploration and Utilization of Space for Peaceful Purposes, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev wrote: "Collaboration in space must unite people and develop an understanding that all of us live on the same planet and it is up to us to see to it that earth is peaceful and flourishing."

The communist party and the Soviet government are systematically in favor of ensuring that space remains an arena of peaceful collaboration, that space serves only the goals of creation, understanding, social progress, the cause of peace, mutual understanding, and collaboration among peoples. Our country has pursued that course since the launching of the first man-made earth satellite.

In the past quarter-century, Soviet space science has traveled from the first simple earth satellite to orbital space complexes of long duration. It has accumulated considerable experience in carrying out orbital and interplanetary space flights, and it has experience in manned flights of long duration, including by women. The successful flight of the Soyuz T-7, the crew of which included Svetlana Savitskaya, marked a new, brilliant stage in Soviet space exploration. It demonstrated once more the enormous capabilities

of Soviet science and technology in studying space and understanding the earth. The assets of our space science include successful handling of such complicated technical tasks as automatic docking of spacecraft in orbit, refueling during flight, unmanned flight to the moon and back, landing of a spacecraft on Venus and on Mars, changing transport vehicles while cosmonauts were aboard the space station, and so on. Our country has by now developed a kind of space industry, with the collaboration of various organizations involved in the creation of space technology: spacecraft, scientific instruments, ground-based testing equipment, cosmonaut simulators, flight-control systems, and so on. We have developed a well-defined methodology in the organization of space research. All of this serves as a good foundation for successful progress forward, for continuation of intensive space exploration in the interests of the country's further scientific-technical, economic, and social development.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

THE POWER OF INITIATIVE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 60-71

[Article by CPSU Vologda Obkom First Secretary A. Drygin]

[Text]

1

The people have an ancient saying: initiative is more precious than money.... Indeed, the first successful step is vital in any undertaking; it plays a mobilizing role and provides the possibility of repeating tested experience by others. This is why the party attaches exceptional importance to the people's labor initiative, the spirit of innovation and questing.

In his "The Immediate Tasks of Soviet Power," V. I. Lenin remarked that unless the efforts of the broad masses are awakened, there can be no question of any revolutionary transformation whatsoever. And later, in connection with the news about the first communist subbotnik at Moscow's Sortirovochnaya Station, Vladimir Il'ich with brilliant foresight assessed the scale and prospects of the workers' awakening initiative and predicted a beautiful future for it, at the same time demanding that all organs of power draw from this great initiative all the enormously important practical lessons to be derived therefrom. "Universal support for this initiative is the chief and prime lesson" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 39, p 26).

The rise of the creative commitment of the working class, the kolkhoz peasantry, and the intelligentsia is a hallmark of our daily labor. It is manifested with the greatest clarity in the course of nationwide socialist competition, which has become one of the motivating forces of the new society's economy. Free labor for the good of the motherland is an inexhaustible source of the Soviet people's creative energy. Here lie the motivating stimuli of many patriotic initiatives, undertakings, and efforts of large worker collectives as well as individual shock workers, leaders, and innovators in production. And although they define their tasks in different ways, their goal is the same: to implement the social and economic development plans mapped out by the country better and more quickly.

The CPSU Central Committee supports the efforts of the masses for creative initiative in every possible way. It promotes accelerated scientific-technical progress, the adoption of intensive labor techniques, and perfection of the economic mechanism. Of enormous mobilizing importance are Comrade

L. I. Brezhnev's messages to initiators and winners in socialist competition, messages in which he not only praises the accomplishments of the people's labor heroism highly but also sets forth the tasks involved in better and broader dissemination of new working techniques in seeking out reserves of production, in the nation's struggle for effectiveness and quality.

Numerous examples can be cited where the fruitful thinking of an individual or a successfully completed experiment conducted within the framework of production in a single enterprise is capable, so to speak, of starting a chain reaction in nearby labor collectives as well as collectives thousands of kilometers distant. Thus, for example, the experience of N. A. Zlobin, a builder in the Moscow area, has gone far beyond the boundaries of the administrative region (or sectors) and has become enriched and strengthened in dissemination. The Rostov people's challenge "Work Without Laggards!" has received an equally broad response. Also serving to enhance production effectiveness is the so-called integrated system of product quality control proposed by the workers of L'vov, the progressive brigade form of organization of labor, the Ipatovo farmers' method, and other initiatives as well. All of these innovations, having come to the Vologda area, have acquired numerous adherents.

The socialist way of life creates conditions favorable for the mass dissemination of the experience of the leading enterprises, organizations, and individual workers, rationalizers whose accomplishments open up favorable possibilities for increasing labor productivity and improving product quality. Of special importance is the fact that the innovators make no secret of their discoveries, because they are vitally interested in seeing to it that their methods, techniques, and experience become accessible to all, the property of all. And there is another point: those who spearhead innovative production, improved technology, and scientific organization are generally communists, who inspire by their specific deeds and personal example. "How communists work," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "largely determines the atmosphere and mood in labor collectives and, consequently, production indicators. Every communist ... in his own sector must give his all, his experience and knowledge, to seek out reserves, enhance labor effectiveness, and set a worthy example of labor dedication."

Vologda Oblast's party organizations are constantly enhancing the communists' vanguard role in the worker collectives, on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and the various organizations, and at the same time doing everything necessary to create a generally favorable creative atmosphere, without which it is impossible to work industriously and harmoniously. Questions of the effectiveness of socialist competition and its closely related propaganda and the dissemination of valuable initiatives, undertakings, and movements are regularly discussed at raykom, gorkom, and obkom buro meetings, plenums, and party aktiv assemblies; they are often on the agenda of party meetings of primary and shop organizations. This helps to instill in people, including leadership cadres, a heightened awareness of the new, the ability to see and provide timely support for everything that is advanced, progressive, brought into being by life itself.

The implementation of social and economic development plans is organically linked to a complicated task of particular concern: how to bring the laggards up to the level of the leaders. Of itself this idea does not at first glance appear new. Work with those who for some reason or another are not fulfilling plans, shift norms, and pledges has never ceased in our oblast. Now, however, it has taken on a new and more concrete direction. Because today's production is distinguished by high parameters of precision, the basic criteria of production growth and effectiveness are conditioned by the precise work rhythm of all participants, by strict compliance with plan discipline in all links, at all levels. Even insignificant infractions and disruptions sometimes give rise to negative and far-reaching consequences, causing a complex chain of misunderstandings and breakdowns not only within a single enterprise but also beyond its bounds.

Here, perhaps, is the special value of the Rostov initiative, although during the first stages some of our comrades saw it as the slogan of a short-lived campaign. Our obkom and its sector departments had to carry out a great deal of local explanatory work and even correct certain executives who took a superficial attitude toward the matter and lacked the necessary sense of responsibility. At the same time, we kept careful track of the dissemination of the initiative, providing its emulators with moral support and methodological aid.

In this connection, mention must be made of the fruitful efforts of the Sokol Gorkom. Having studied the experience of interaction between leaders and laggards, the party committee undertook serious efforts to strengthen business cooperation between competing labor collectives. The first to respond to this were the communists of the Sokol Pulp and Paper Combine, who worked out a series of measures to help their colleagues at the Sukhon Plant. The Sukhon workers had more than once experienced difficulties in the technological process, resulting in sporadic utilization of the equipment and adversely affecting product quality. This kind of production instability gave rise to labor conflicts as well as cadre turnover. And whenever the labor contingent changes frequently, of course, it is difficult to achieve effectiveness. A vicious circle! The only way to break it was to build up the collective's confidence in its own strength, to inspire the desire to struggle against difficulties that came in their way.... It was, overall, a difficult task that the party committee and the management of the Sokol combine set for themselves. It was necessary to make a great effort, and the people responded willingly. The engineering-technical personnel made a substantial contribution to the sponsorship effort. During the project they also detected and eliminated shortcomings in communists' job assignments and in the organization of labor of the in-plant services. They even raised the question of replacing the manager of the solid-fiber tiles shop. The Sokol Pulp and Paper Combine sent over party member V. M. Makhlin, an excellent organizer of production (with his consent of course).

The measures that were taken proved to be timely and effective. The labor collaboration between the two related collectives is now on an equal footing. Following the Sokol example, the work-without-laggards indicator has been introduced as a decisive one in tallying the results of socialist competition

in other industrial enterprises of the oblast. As a result, we have sharply reduced the number of lagging brigades, shifts, and sections. Most of them are now working rhythmically and filling quarterly and monthly plans.

The people's spirit of collectivism, high awareness, and conscientious attitude toward labor and their job duties constitute the nutrient medium in which bold initiatives are born and all valuable and advanced developments that come into being outside the specific enterprise, facility, rayon, or oblast are emulated. It is very important, moreover, that the resourcefulness and organizational abilities of the rank-and-file workers and leadership cadres not be kept under a bushel or dispersed in trivialities.

2

The people's initiative and resourcefulness require more than mere armchair support--they require live participation and broad openness at all stages of adoption. This helps to establish the real value of the new. As the initiative develops it gains followers, and thus the process is accelerated. Any creative undertaking is valuable to the extent that it incorporates a two-fold goal--economic and political-educational. And it is difficult to give preference to either one--each complements the other.

A logical development of the "Work Without Laggards!" slogan was the fact that in subsequent years it was supplemented and enriched by other initiatives of national significance such as "Workers Guarantee of the Five-Year Plan of Quality," "From the High Quality of the Work of Each to the High Effectiveness of the Labor of the Collective," "Heavy Labor on the Shoulders of Machines," and "Engineering Support for the Workers' Initiative." Competition to accelerate the assimilation of new capacity also grew in scope, and brigade forms of organization of labor and the cost-accounting contract became widespread. We did not intend just to copy, let's say, someone else's specific experience, and so today we can reasonably speak of the creative approach of our leading party organizations to the selection, study, generalization, and finally the adoption of up-to-date forms of labor collaboration and mutual help.

The successful work of the Vologda Flax Combine imeni 50-letiya VLKSM is largely due to the fact that the technical retooling of the enterprise was backed up by the movement of collective forms of organization of labor and mass mentorship. At present more than 200 weavers--85 percent of the total--are working in expanded service zones. Party member T. A. Kopnina called upon her brigade comrades to complete the 11th Five-Year Plan in 3 years and 9 months. This initiative has already been joined by 57 of her emulators, and many of them have pledged to complete three yearly plans by the day of the 60th Anniversary of the Formation of the USSR.

An analysis of the practice conducted by specialists of the NOT [Scientific Organization of Labor] group showed that the collective's increased productivity is due both to the higher level of knowledge of the rank-and-file workers and their constantly growing labor and political commitment. This is also fostered by everyone's profound interest in the end quantitative and

qualitative results. In the personal pledges of the shock workers of socialist competition and innovators in production there are several important sections. There is the matter of fostering professional skills and mastery in the younger generation, instilling a sense of justified pride in one's enterprise. Now when tallying the production work results of the brigades and sections it is mandatory to take account of the level of stability of the cadre personnel. In this way we strengthen the collective's responsibility for creating in the combine a favorable ideological-political atmosphere of mutual exactingness and strict accountability from each for the success of all.

The selection and implementation of a specific initiative serving the tasks of further intensification of productive forces are largely determined and regulated by the specifics of the enterprise, its capabilities. Also taken into account are the technical equipment level and the cadre composition, also the prospects of development and sector affiliation. Before implementing large-scale conversion to quality control, for example, the obkom proposed testing the system in eight base enterprises representing the basic sectors of industry. Earlier still, a group of party and economic workers and specialists visited the initiators of the movement in L'vov Oblast, where our comrades were given the opportunity to study comprehensively the experience of creative interaction between production and scientific collectives in such a complicated and difficult matter as the struggle to ensure high-quality industrial output.

The practical aspects of the matter and particular problems of disseminating the system, taking account of local conditions, were then discussed at a special scientific-practical conference. By that time we had acquired our own experience in the shops of State Bearing Plant No 23. Several years earlier they tested out and firmly adopted what is known as the Saratov system of defect-free labor, also the experience of the Volga Motor Vehicle Plant in the struggle for labor quality at the highest organizational-technical level. I will not cite statistical data illustrating the effective work of this young enterprise of the sector but will merely note one fact: the Volga Motor Vehicle Plant abolished incoming control on products coming from State Bearing Plant No 23 several years ago.

Life goes forward, and constantly gives rise to new tasks. An executive who is content even with high results but does not take care of the future of the enterprise and fails to enrich himself with new productive ideas, of course, cannot count on stability in the work--sooner or later he will find himself insolvent, his position eroded. We cannot, therefore, agree with those who complain about the plethora of initiatives that are launched. The trouble lies elsewhere--the inability to make the correct choice! In some places, for example, people get carried away by the quantity aspect instead of focusing their strength and attention on the practical adoption of a few promising initiatives. Still other collective leaders, desiring to seem up-to-date and progressive, are willing to respond grandly to any challenge, even though generally the matter does not go beyond mere words. Or else, for example, giving in to the general mood and on the spur of the moment--look, people--they do support the initiative, but then other day-to-day cares get

in the way, and things return to the old routine. At times, moreover, the simplest rules and well-known duties are issued with regard to the new development, without which production is hardly conceivable at all. And the underlying cause of all this is the desire to stand out, to act like an initiator.

This is why, in party work, it is very important to be able to distinguish real from imaginary values. It is vital not to overlook the stage of inception of a prospective initiative, and not only to record it in the minutes but also to back up the initiator promptly.

The brigade contract method had trouble taking root on our construction projects. After N. A. Zlobin's initiative was approved by the CPSU Central Committee, the central and local press published detailed articles elucidating the essence of the new work organization in construction subunits. Then the construction trusts began to receive through departmental channels many directives and recommendations drawn up "from above," which recounted in detail the experience of this innovator and gave advice on how to speed up the adoption process.

The necessity of broad dissemination of the brigade contract method on construction projects was brought up several times at an obkom buro meeting, was discussed at plenums, and also in the oblast's gorkoms and raykoms. Everyone agreed that the innovation should be permanently instituted, but matters proceeded rather slowly. Then the obkom's construction department was directed to look into the causes delaying the implementation of the progressive initiative. A detailed investigation showed that it was the trust and administration executives, rather than the brigade workers, who were being overly cautious--in a word, those who by their position are directly responsible for disseminating advanced methods of labor organization. Some comrades were afraid they wouldn't be able to ensure the necessary engineering preparation for the projects under construction and supply them with materials.

In such cases, local experience is very helpful. A good example of a genuine party approach to the matter was set by the party committee of Vologdassel'sstroy Trust. Members of the party committee made a detailed study of the Zlobin method and for a start proposed that K. Lysukhin's brigade, engaged in the building of poultry plant facilities, take it up. The trust's labor and wages office was directed to prepare the terms of a contract agreement between the brigade and the mechanized column and enter individual accounts of labor expenditures. The experiment was successful, and its advantages over the traditional system of organization of labor were obvious. Moreover, the brigade managed to shorten the construction timetable and substantially reduce material costs.

The party committee generalized the experience and recommended that it be disseminated to all subunits in the trust. Responsibility for keeping track of the implementation was assigned to a commission monitoring the administration's performance. In a little over 2 years contract brigades were created in each mobile mechanized column. It is indicative that one of the most vigorous followers of the Zlobin method on the rural construction projects of

the Vologda area, brigade leader M. Bubyakin, who won the USSR State Prize. This collective's work experience has been approved by the obkom buro.

Gradually, the brigade contract method has taken root in other trusts. To a large extent this has been facilitated by yearly seminars for leaders of cost-accounting brigades and party and economic officials; the seminars generally discuss current problems and ways to enhance the effectiveness of capital construction. They also provide opportunities to get acquainted with technological advances and new forms of organization of labor.

Since the 10th Five-Year Plan, construction organizations no longer merely plan the "scope" of the brigade contract but also focus major attention on work quality. In that time the volume of construction-installation work completed by the contract method has risen from 8 to 53 percent within Cherepovetsmetallurgkhimstroy Association alone. For the first time in the oblast, in the construction of the oxygen converter shop of the Cherepovets Metallurgy Plant a consolidated integrated brigade was set up headed by party member A. Grekov, winner of the USSR Council of Ministers Prize. The brigade completed a large contract worth 1.3 million rubles. The facility--a continuous steel-casting section--was delivered ahead of schedule. Labor productivity increased by 30 percent. Already there are 27 such brigades in the Cherepovetsmetallurgkhimstroy Association. In industrial and housing construction, increasing use is being made of a progressive new form of contract --integral-process continuous brigade cost accounting. The advantages of this method are indisputable, but there are plenty of reserves as well: up to now the oblast's construction workers are completing only 40 percent of the total work volume by the brigade contract method.

In order to enhance the organization and consistency of the adoption of initiatives and positive experience, we have placed the monitoring of the matter in the hands of the permanent commissions for the supervision of socialist competition. These have been set up in all the gorkoms and raykoms. Last year and this, the Vologda Gorkom discussed matters involved in disseminating the brigade system of labor organization and the ZIL initiative "Engineering Support for the Workers Initiative," which were approved by the CPSU Central Committee. The gorkom has also discussed a number of aspects of intersector socialist competition among enterprises and organizations of rail, river, and automotive transport working under a single agreement. A number of the city's industrial enterprises have coordination groups whose task is to acquaint the masses with thoroughly tested techniques for enhancing work effectiveness and quality.

One of the most important problems of the 11th Five-Year Plan, as was mentioned at the 26th CPSU Congress, is the increasingly complicated demographic situation. This problem is of vital importance. The obkom is focusing much attention on initiatives and movements which are directly or indirectly oriented toward technical improvement of production and on reducing the amount of manual labor and the number of workers.

Valuable experience in this regard has been accumulated by the party committee of the Cherepovets Steel-Rolling Plant, whose performance was recently

reviewed by the obkom. Conversion to collective forms of labor organization have required the concerted efforts and diligence of the enterprise's communists. In the forefront of the effort were production leaders and shock workers, innovators, and rationalizers who were well aware that the piece-work system frequently acted as an obstacle in the way of increasing labor productivity. In varying contexts these issues were raised during the discussion of plans and the tallying of the results of socialist competition.

Opinions about the brigade organization of labor were divided. Some people saw it as a virtual panacea for all ills, while others thought that working on a single order was nothing but egalitarianism and would not last long. These conflicting opinions resulted generally from the fact that people were inadequately informed. Aware of this, the enterprise's party committee decided to organize lectures in all of the plant's production units to discuss the nature of collective forms of work organization. The practical seminar, however, was not held at the plant but at State Bearing Plant No 23, where the steelworkers were able to get acquainted with the experience of the machine builders. After that visit, a round-table meeting with the plant's propagandists was held in the political education office; there was a frank exchange of opinions on a series of problems that came up. The materials of the round table were published by STALEPROKATCHIK, the in-house newspaper. And the propagandists and agitators, in turn, organized collective discussions in the shops and sections.

At the suggestion of party members from the calibration shop, several questions regarding collective forms of labor organization were included in the program of schools of communist labor. By dealing with complex problems, the students (mostly rank-and-file workers and middle-level cadres) expanded their horizons and acquired real-life experience and knowledge very beneficial for understanding and mastering the basic principles, goals, and tasks of the brigades. All of this helped in the successful implementation of the program. Conversion to the brigade system was accomplished relatively quickly and in well-organized fashion. At present the Cherepovets Steel-Rolling Plant has 526 brigades, constituting 82.4 percent of the total number of workers there. Primary production cells, set up on a voluntary basis, are each made up of 10 to 14 workers of various trades.

The brigade system gives people the desire to work in a communist manner; it polishes their professional skills and shapes their sense of comradely support, mutual help, discipline, and organization. The brigade is strong in its cost-accounting independence, backed up by a bilateral agreement between its members and the administration. The brigade leader's functions are performed by the most experienced and politically mature worker. The opinions of all the brigade's members are taken into account when appointing him.

Incidentally, the quest did not stop there. Early in the 11th Five-Year Plan, the Vologda bearing makers took up and developed the idea of integral-process related brigades sharing a common technological task. Members of communist S. A. Kotin's brigade called upon their nearest partners--workers in the grinding-assembly, heat treatment and lathe shops--to combine forces and work under a single order. Participants in the competition very soon

detected real benefits. For example, the pay is apportioned to the brigade's members in accordance with the amount of time spent, individual grade, and the coefficient of labor participation that has been adopted. The most important condition of labor interaction is not to let down one's comrades, each of whom is similarly responsible for the others. This sense of worker solidarity strengthens the desire to work productively, at full output, and encourages the members to improve their professional skills and share their personal experience and knowledge with those around them.

The new form of labor relations has been taken up by the electricians, mechanics, instrument makers, and the ball-bearing and separator shop workers. Cooperation in industry, however, is not confined to just one plant, rayon, oblast, or even the whole country. The competition has been joined by collectives having no other ties, by what might be called administrative ties: the "workers relay" has linked the production interests of State Bearing Plant No 23 to those of other enterprises of our motherland, in particular the Kiev Automatic Machine Tool Plant imeni Gor'kiy, the Leningrad Plant imeni Il'ich, Moscow's Kalibr, and, finally, the parent institute of the bearing industry. Also participating on an equal footing in this competition are our partners abroad, for example the GDR's 7 October Machine Tool Association (Berlin-Marzan).

From the very first, the business collaboration between Vologda's production and scientific collectives not only developed in the sphere of technology and labor organization but also encompassed various aspects of party life. Party meetings and bureau sessions frequently examine and analyze the performance of particular collectives in the struggle for production effectiveness and work quality for improved utilization of productive capital, faster adoption of measures, initiatives, and project-design applications already mapped out, and other matters relating to tasks of scientific-technical progress. The methods of collectives which are in the vanguard are adopted by all. In exceptional cases a joint party committee meeting is called with the participation of party organization secretaries, enterprise officials, and chief specialists; they discuss the cardinal problems of production, get rid of departmental conflicts, and examine long-range plans of collective collaboration.

"The workers relay" has often been called the friendship relay. This form of labor collaboration, in truth, embodies a powerful educational charge. Its basic condition is mutual aid, every participant's responsibility for everyone else--and not only within the walls of one enterprise. Questions of regulating relationships arise rather frequently in a cooperative system, requiring the intervention of an arbitration court or other higher authorities. It is quite another matter when the collectives are working under a collaboration agreement. This makes it possible to synchronize their actions and work according to the principle: "From Mutual Recriminations to Mutual Aid."

Evaluating the experience of the collective organization of labor in the 10th Five-Year Plan, it must be stated that its economic effectiveness has been rather high in our oblast's enterprises. In the course of competition among

participants in the "workers relay" and the integral-process cost-accounting brigades, a substantial number of additional products have been developed, and thousands of workers have been provisionally released.

Such are the reserves of agricultural production alone. And there are plenty of them in agricultural as well.

3

Some officials don't spare the paper in drawing up wordy memoranda and reports in which one frequently detects a striving either to excuse his personal lack of initiative and competence by pleading objective factors, or to prove at any cost that, look, we've been working hard, but there are just too many difficulties.

I could hardly help thinking about this as I reviewed data concerning the cadre situation in the oblast's livestock farming. Of considerable concern is the fact that many milkmaids have now grown old, yet in many places replacements have not been trained. There are reasons for this, of course, and some of them cannot be ignored--they must be taken into account in drafting social and economic development plans. Nevertheless, some people manage through their own efforts to change the established order of things, to bring something new into the effort, to work successfully. What is it, a matter of luck? Here are two figures from a statistical report: the column across from Tarnogskiy Rayon shows that one out of every two milkmaids is about 30, while one-third of the livestock farmers are Komsomol members.

An immediate reservation must be made: Tarnogskiy Rayon is remote even by Vologda standards. The general opinion, moreover, is that probably the main reason why young people are leaving the countryside is that the towns are located too far from the administrative and cultural centers; this, of course, gives rise to certain difficulties in terms of young men and women continuing their education and (no less important) finding interesting and meaningful entertainment. Yet the Tarnogskiy Rayon experience does not jibe with this widespread opinion. It certainly is remote--from the rayon center to Vologda is a distance of 1,500 kilometers, and it's 100 kilometers to the nearest railroad station. Nevertheless, things are lively there, as the facts attest. Most of the farms there ended up with a profit in the last five-year plan and substantially increased the production output of the livestock complexes and fields. Three times the rayon has been named among the winners in all-union socialist competition. But probably the main accomplishment is the fact that the villages of Tarnogskiy Rayon are getting definitely younger. If we take a careful look at the characteristics of the lifestyle there, we can state confidently that the tone is set by the raykom headed by First Secretary Mikhail Pavlovich Zykov.

Zykov has gone through the good school of life--from an ordinary kolkhoznik to a village schoolteacher, and then the school's director. Later he was elected chairman of the board of a lagging farm, and he raised it to a position of leadership in the rayon. M. P. Zykov's ideological conviction is organically combined with an ability to interact with people and talk their

language. Mikhail Pavlovich, moreover, is a purposeful and industrious man of great willpower. And by the way, we cannot help mentioning one subtlety which, unfortunately, not everyone perceives.... A strong will is really an important and extremely essential character trait for a party leader, but it is wrong to equate strong-willed people with so-called willful methods of administration, which attest to a weak nature rather than a strong one.

A feeling for the new is a remarkable quality in a party official, and it becomes valuable when combined with the art of persuasion. And it is a good thing when this is complemented by exactingness, tact, and the ability to carry things through.

Sometimes a great deal of harm is caused by hastiness, which is sometimes confused with energy and dispatch. These concepts, however, are by no means equivalent. The Tarnogskiy Raykom has developed an excellent, businesslike workstyle. Serious problems there are studied thoroughly right in the primary party organizations of the farms. Only after a meticulous preliminary working-through of a particular problem at a raykom buro meeting, a plenum, or a conference is a coordinated decision taken, which then becomes binding on everyone.

The same kind of approach, well-reasoned as only peasants can, was taken by the rayon in resolving the problem of keeping young people on the farm. Officials of the raykom's apparatus have close contacts with farm workers; they have an excellent knowledge of village life, of local manners and customs. Staff members of the agitation and propaganda department focused on the fact that kolkhoz boys and girls are more willing to take up farm trades if this does not involve going outside the rayon and leaving their family for a long time. The raykom utilized this in its work, based on the characteristics of local customs. An agricultural trade school was set up, based in the public school, to train multiply skilled machinery operators, electricians, and milking-machine operators. Life itself has fully validated the correctness of this decision, although to some extent this would seem to contradict today's trend toward building big local training combines, indeed in several rayons at once. Tarnogskiy Rayon's Agricultural Trade School No 9 is small, but it is outfitted with up-to-date technical equipment and excellent visual aids. In addition, it has gathered together a qualified collective of teachers and educators. Graduates of the local schools are glad to go there. During the past five-year plan the school trained 747 graduates, who are now working successfully in the fields, on the livestock farms, and in the shops of the kolkhozes and sovkhoses. On the example of the Tarnogskiy Rayon Agricultural Trade School we are building trade schools and branches in other rayons of the oblast as well. This good initiative is spreading farther and farther, and it is gaining more and more followers. As far as they are able the oblast organizations are helping them with methodological, organizational, and material support. But the most important thing in economic practice is local initiative, the creative approach.

Competent correlation of planning management with economic autonomy and initiative, and unity of the principles of sectorial and territorial development --these are the characteristics of economic administration at the present

stage. It is toward this approach that the party orients its cadres locally. And, as life shows, creating conditions which maximally encourage the development of the people's initiative makes it possible to resolve many of today's problems successfully and achieve high indicators with optimal outlays. In the process, account is taken of the provisional division of initiatives into local, sectorial, and all-union, depending on how much they contribute to the national economy and the scope of their dissemination. There is a logic in this gradation. It helps to systematize the results, differentiating the process of competition itself, which unquestionably strengthens its effectiveness and its yield. Gryazovetskiy Rayon, for example, has for some years conducted a competition among thousandaire milkmaids for a prize named for Hero of Socialist Labor A. G. Ivanova, a veteran livestock farmer on Rostilovski Sovkhoz. Participants in this competition must produce at least 100 tons of milk from the herd of cows assigned to them. This is a local target, but it has a mobilizing effect and shows all competitors (especially young people) the real way to labor success.

A remarkable initiative has been launched by several leading weavers of the Vologda Flax Combine, brigade leader T. A. Kopnina, T. A. Sveshnikova, and N. A. Gusarina. They decided to list as posthumous members of their brigade P. I. Zhizhin and R. N. Gudkov, workers who died in the Great Patriotic War. Earnings credited to the personal accounts of these fallen comrades are contributed to the peace fund. This patriotic initiative has been taken up not only by enterprises in the textile industry but has also spread to construction, transport, the food industry, the woodworking industry, and other sectors.

Recently the obkom approved the work experience of the party committee of Kolkhoz imeni Kirov in Sheksninskiy Rayon, which has introduced the continuous-shop system of milk production, and recommended it for adoption on other farms in the oblast.

We are keeping close track of how this progressive method of labor organization is making its way. It involves radical restructuring of long-entrenched work practices among milkmaids. Their main defect, as we know, is that the livestock farmers' work day is much too long--from 4 o'clock in the morning to 8 or 9 at night. This seriously hampers the selection of cadres for work in the livestock complexes, yet it is not an easy matter to overcome the force of inertia. What was especially needed was systematic explanation work among the livestock farmers, who, however, kept to their old ways just from habit, yet were willing in spirit to leave the beaten path. This, of course, requires an abrupt change, a certain inner effort. Peasant women know very well that cows become strongly accustomed to established procedures on the farm and in the pasture; these take the form of conditioned reflexes which are reflected in the behavior and the productivity of the animals. This is why many milkmaids are willing to undergo certain hardships but will not deviate from habit.

The party committee on Kolkhoz imeni Kirov took this sector of the operation under special control. The Churovskaya Livestock Complex formed a solid nucleus of active advocates of the new development, including party members

and nonmembers. Communist milkmaids Ye. S. Kapustina and T. S. Kozhukhova showed the way. They were the first to master the continuous-shop technology of milk production.

But not everyone believed immediately in the success of the new method. There were some who doubted and vacillated. Nevertheless, most of them took the side of the innovators and trusted them. And soon the innovation proved itself fully: milk yields began to rise, prime costs declined. Moreover, the workers in the complex had more time for rest, studies, and entertainment, also for work on household plots which, of course, is also of great importance. Some 43 dairy complexes and large livestock farms in the oblast have now converted to the link system of labor. This has resulted in releasing over 300 workers, who have transferred to other sectors of agricultural production.

Analyzing these results, we have concluded that the practical implementation of new initiatives requires a creative approach, the daily attention of economic executives and party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations. You won't get anywhere by storming or by fits and starts. Nor is everything all that smooth with respect to the organization of harvesting-transport detachments on the Ipatovo model. Some rayons attempted to set them up without taking account of local conditions and characteristics. In some cases people thought they had done what was necessary--issued an order, drafted the terms. In short, they thought the thing was well-launched, all they had to do was wait for the results. But nothing came of it. That meant that the innovation had not really reached the people, it didn't motivate them or encourage them.

The struggle for scientific-technical progress cannot be waged with a cold heart: it takes enthusiasm, boldness, and decisiveness to attain the economic heights targeted for the Soviet people by the party's Food Program. Implementation of the program will require all our knowledge, all our organizational talent, all the party's rich accumulated experience of work with the masses. An important role here, as was emphasized at the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, is assigned to the rural raykoms and the party organizations of the labor collectives.

The decisions of the May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum evoked a new upsurge in the labor and political commitment of the farm workers. More milk, meat, and eggs have been sold to the state than last year. The kolkhozes and sovkhoses have substantially increased procurements of coarse and succulent fodder. Grain yields have been higher, and many farms have harvested 25 to 30 quintals of grain per hectare. The farmers of Rodina Kolkhoz, Vologodskiy Rayon, who initiated competition for completion of five-year plan targets ahead of schedule, have harvested an average of 48 quintals of grain.

The oblast's industry has overfulfilled the 9-months' plan. Additional sales of commodities have amounted to tens of millions of rubles. The volume of industrial output has increased by 5.1 percent, labor productivity by 4.7 percent.

In accordance with the new tasks, major responsibility rests on the shoulders of the workers of the ideological front. They are called upon to ensure, so to speak, the full ideological content of mass competition to achieve the party's goals, to increase the country's food resources. Under their influence we see a gradual renovation of the organizational, educational, and propaganda activities of the party organizations. Worthy of special mention is the initiative manifested by the propagandists and agitation collectives of Sheksninskiy Rayon, who have launched a movement under the slogan: Enhance the effectiveness of party agitation and propaganda in the struggle to implement social and economic development plans.

We attach exceptional importance to openness, the generalization of advanced experience, the creation of conditions favorable for its adoption. To do this requires the living word of the propagandist, visual agitation, the local press, television, and radio, schools of advanced experience, scientific-technical seminars, and conferences. Widespread use is made of social inspections, technical contests, in which anyone who wants to takes part. The fighting spirit of every party organization and every party member is measured by today's strict standards according to whether they promoted the creation of an atmosphere of harmonious, creative effort in the collectives and encouraged their comrades in the same quest.

New names of right-flankers of the five-year plan are appearing every busy working day. An attentive attitude toward the experience of their efforts enriches the practice of socialist competition and, unquestionably, helps to carry out the party's short-term and long-term plans oriented toward implementation of the decisions taken at the May CPSU Central Committee Plenum and to ensure the further progress of the whole national economy.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

REPLENISHMENT OF THE WORK FORCE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 72-83

[Article by Yu. Demin]

[Text] Young people are the most mobile segment of labor resources. Young men and women are constantly seeking their place in life; they lack as yet production experience and qualifications nor, as a rule, do they have their own property, home, or family. They can "travel light," willingly travel to far regions to build new cities and enterprises and develop sparsely populated territories. Frequently, however, their mobility is disorganized and unregulated by plan (young people make up more than two-thirds of all migrating workers). There are some who manage to "master" several different specialties and change jobs a dozen times before the age of 30.

The right to choose a profession, as is stated in the USSR Constitution, is exercised in accordance with one's calling, abilities, vocational training, and education, as well as society's needs. It is very important, therefore, to help young people in good time to realize their creative potential fully and get proper guidance in life, to become prepared for socially useful labor both psychologically and professionally.

The 26th party congress set the task of strengthening work on vocational guidance in the schools and providing for the further development of a network of vocational-technical schools as a vital source of replenishing the national economy's worker cadres.

Labor Upbringing in the Schools

From the earliest grades, schoolchildren are trained in labor classes to work with cardboard, paper, leather, and wood, and to master skills of handling simple tools. They are also put to work collecting secondary raw materials, landscaping and beautifying the grounds, and so on. However, overall labor guidance must, of course, be supplemented with vocational guidance to awaken the pupils' interest in the mass trades as well.

As we know, it is hard for adolescents to choose the work they prefer without having first-hand acquaintance with it, without matching their abilities against the requirements placed on them. Some schools benefit greatly from the help of sponsoring enterprises which outfit training shops and workshops

with equipment, machine tools, supplies, and instruments, provide instructors who are production leaders and labor veterans, and promote the development of technical creativity and the organization of various circles oriented toward the worker trades.

Within a single school, however, pupils in the older grades as a rule gain acquaintance only with one specialty, or at best two or three, which are frequently unrelated to their own aspirations and desires or the needs of the rayon's and city's enterprises. A very promising form of getting pupils involved in socially useful labor, one which helps them get acquainted with one of the trades early on and begin mastering it, is the interschool training-production combine (UPK). Such combines are better provided with machine tools and equipment than the schools are. Furthermore, an attempt is made to shape the training profile in such combines on the basis of the work force requirements of the associations, plants, and factories. Since ninth graders are not yet fully aware of their aspirations, they have the opportunity to change the labor training profile in the first semester.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Further Improvement of the Instruction and Upbringing of Public School Pupils and Their Labor Training" (1977) calls for further development of the UPKs. These combines are now functioning in every oblast, city, and in many rayons. In the past five-year plan their network grew almost tenfold.

One of the first UPKs was opened in the 1969-70 school year in Moscow's Baumanskiy Rayon at the initiative of the raykom. Eleven rayon enterprises took part in setting up its material base. Instruction is provided along 10 different lines (auto mechanic, lathe and milling machine operator, sewn goods production, computer technology, radio electronics, and so on). The combine has considerable resources for pupils' labor upbringing outside of school hours as well. Komsomol students and teachers of the Moscow Higher Technical School imeni N. E. Bauman helped to organize circles in applied cybernetics, metalworking, and radio mechanics. A House of Technical Creativity was opened up in association with the combine, and new circles were formed in amateur photography, weaving, and leatherworking.

Gaining skills in highly qualified labor, pupils in the upper grades are turning out goods worth tens of thousands of rubles. The main benefit, however, is not material. The pupils are mastering the requirements of present-day production earlier. For them, planning and technological discipline and responsibility for one's assigned task are no longer merely abstract concepts but tangible ones, verified in their own experience which no textbook can replace. Here, adolescents are training themselves psychologically to select the trade they prefer.

At present the country's public education system includes more than 2,200 UPKs. Some 40 percent of all pupils in the upper grades are involved in this form of labor training. Nevertheless, the UPKs have not yet fully realized all their training and upbringing reserves. Some of them provide the pupils not so much with vocational guidance as with misguidance. It's not just that they lack sufficient supplies and tools or that their equipment and gear are

incomplete or obsolete. It is primarily a matter of poor organization of the training-upbringing process. Sometimes pupils take 2 full years to machine one or two simple parts ordered by the base enterprises. The monotonous, meaningless work quickly begins to bore the adolescents. And, all too often, the enterprises take a pro forma attitude toward the pupils' production practice. It often happens that the schoolchildren, without having learned anything, are given top grades in labor training and sometimes even monetary awards. This kind of "labor upbringing," to put it mildly, has not just a neutral but a negative effect.

The UPKs by no means provide exposure to all the trades needed by local enterprises. Very few pupils, for example, master the skills of lathe and milling machine operators, builders, and metallurgists, although these are in high demand, and conversely there are many who are involved in the automotive trades. Certainly drivers and mechanics are essential to the national economy. Nevertheless, the array of specialties taught in the UPKs ought to be revised and expanded.

All too frequently, the knowledge acquired by the pupils is not backed up by practical work. General education and labor training are conducted in parallel and even interfere with one another, since they are not coordinated in terms of time. The UPK programs deal very little with questions of theory, and there is a tendency to present everything at once, without singling out the main points. There are considerable difficulties because of the lack of textbooks for the pupils and methods guides for the teachers.

Consistently implementing the Leninist agrarian policy, our party is accomplishing a steady rise in the national economy and in the production of food-stuffs. Nevertheless, the food problem is by no means off the agenda. The May 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum mapped out precisely the concrete tasks involved in resolving this vital problem, the ways to overcome present shortcomings. "But these measures," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized at the plenum, "will yield the desired results only if we learn to make much better use of machinery and fertilizer than we do now, better use of everything that agriculture now possesses or will possess." Overall intensification of production is possible only when highly skilled experts, genuine masters of the land, are working in the fields and livestock complexes.

Pupil production brigades have now been set up in practically all village and settlement schools; in them, adolescents learn the basics of agricultural production and organization, and learn the operation of tractors, combines, and other machinery. In the better ones all relations are handled by a brigade council (which includes the school director, a teacher of labor and biology, an agronomist or veterinarian from the agricultural enterprise, and pupils). Pupil brigade leaders are frequently elected members of kolkhoz boards. As a rule, these kids are real "live wires" who have a beneficial effect on their schoolmates, who in turn respect their authority and emulate their example. If these pupil brigades are assigned permanent sections of land and equipment, and if the school kids carry out the work cycle the year round, the practice awakens their interest and respect for the agricultural

trades, builds character, and instills a sense of goals and duty. The adolescents who work in them generally remain on their home farm.

This manner of organizing the work, unfortunately, does not prevail everywhere. In many of the schools of Vitebsk, Ryazan', and Tashkent oblasts and the Dagestan ASSR the pupil production brigades do not have their own land sections and equipment; they are restricted to raising one particular kind of crop and wind up their work as early as the beginning of July. All too frequently, the schoolchildren are assigned to carry out just a few operations such as weeding, thinning, transplanting, and so on. As a result, all they develop is the desire to get good grades in the summer labor quarter. The kids get involved in real production too late, resulting in delayed social maturation.

The shock front on the farm is livestock raising. Since the 18th Komsomol Congress more than 500,000 girls and boys have been assigned to this sector by volunteer call-up, but the number of Komsomol livestock farmers in the country as a whole is rising rather slowly, and in some places decreasing, for example in Belgorod, Lipetsk, Yaroslavl', Vinnitsa, Ural', and Ternopol' oblasts. This is happening, in particular, because livestock farm complexes are only rarely assigned to pupil brigades. Meanwhile, younger schoolchildren could be tending rabbits while older ones could take care of sheep and piglets. Still older pupils could be entrusted with cows and horses. This would make it possible for children in their early years to acquire a love not only for the land but also the animals, with increasingly difficult livestock-tending tasks assigned to them.

Graduates of the village secondary schools of Omsk Oblast came out with a remarkable initiative on the eve of the 19th Komsomol Congress: they decided to link their destiny to that of their own kolkhoz or sovkhoz, to take up livestock farming. In his warm and heartfelt message to the young people of Omsk Oblast, L. I. Brezhnev wrote as follows: "You have acquired your first labor skills in the pupil production brigades and livestock links. You must constantly fill out and perfect your knowledge and make expert use of it in practice, becoming genuine masters of your trade. Always remember that the implementation of the Food Program, the people's well-being, and our great country's might depend on your conscientious and diligent labor in social livestock farming." It is the duty of the collectives of the village schools, sovkhozes, kolkhozes, and party and Komsomol organizations to make the labor efforts in the pupil brigades an organic part of the whole process of upbringing, to broadly support the initiative of the youngsters of Omsk.

A central figure in the village, as is well known, is the machinery operator. During the All-Union Technical Training Drive in 1980-1981 about 3 million girls and boys mastered machinery operating specialties and sharpened their skills. In a number of rayons, however, there is an acute shortage of such cadres.

One reason for this, again, is delayed social maturation. At present, minor pupils have the right to perform manual labor only. Life itself shows, however, that in the village many of the children of machinery operators learn to handle equipment by the age of 12 or 14 and sometimes take their

elders' place during the harvest season or work as combine operator helpers. Frequently the kids become friends with young tractor drivers, who allow them to operate the equipment. As a result, adolescents get the chance to work productively in the fields 3 or 4 years earlier and gradually get involved in the swing of things. It would seem reasonable to allow pupils from the age of 14 to work on agricultural machinery under the supervision of mentors. By acquiring knowledge and production skills early on, proceeding from the simple to the more difficult, they could become better prepared for labor and make a more conscious choice of their trade.

It will be necessary to train all village young people in the mass trades during the 11th Five-Year Plan. What the countryside needs now is not just tractor and combine drivers but real masters of agriculture--people of comprehensive and profound knowledge. Also needed are drivers, repairmen, builders, and trade and public catering workers. The interschool UPKs can help young people to get right involved in mastering these trades. In Gayvoron, Kirovograd Oblast, for example, a training town has been built for the UPK; there the older pupil can master the specialty of his choice--driver, tractor operator, machinery operator, fruit or vegetable farmer, livestock specialist, vehicle repair mechanic, electrician, stonemason, installer, plasterer-painter, lathe operator, cabinetmaker, agrochemical laboratory assistant, typist, or whatever. Two-thirds of the combine's graduates are sent to work on the farm.

Nevertheless, there are still many shortcomings in the labor training and vocational guidance of schoolchildren. Frequently, adolescents become disillusioned in the specialty they have mastered. In the country as a whole, only one-fifth of all school graduates choose jobs on the basis of their labor training profile.

Prior to the Choice

During their maturation stage, adolescents look deeply into themselves, think about who they are and what they are capable of. Frequently, pupils in school think that the only course worthy of them is to enter a VUZ or at least a secondary specialized school. Their parents have their own worries. Some are concerned about the prestige of a future specialty and the material benefits it brings, others hope to continue the family's vocational tradition, while still others crave to see their own unrealized dreams fulfilled in their children.

For a long time the schools oriented their graduates chiefly toward the VUZs. The number of those entering VUZs constituted probably the main indicator of the school's success. For this reason, teachers frequently strove to channel their pupils into the institute without regard to their inclinations, abilities, or the national economy's cadre requirements. Since this is just what the parents and the pupils wanted, not very much "vocational guidance" was needed. The only problem was which VUZ to choose.

The main thrust now in preparing pupils to make a conscious choice of profession is to orient them toward entering the secondary PTUs [vocational-

technical schools] and technical schools. All too frequently, unfortunately, this effort in the schools is conducted only sporadically. And then when the 8th graders or 10th graders have only a few months left they are suddenly deluged with a flood of information that overwhelms them, and instead of a deliberate choice of vocation they are "clamorously" importuned by various enterprises, PTUs, and technical schools. Striving to prepare pupils in good time to make a conscious choice of labor specialty, help them find their way, and restrain them from making the wrong step, the country's secondary-school collectives have begun to set up vocational guidance commissions. They determine the life plans of the boys and girls and their desires to obtain a particular specialty. The answers are matched against the responses of class leaders and teachers. If a pupil's life plans match his inclinations (determined chiefly on the basis of grades in school subjects), the commission approves the choice of vocation. If not, it advises him to revise his life plans in the time remaining until the end of school and make them more realistic. The commission again consults with him prior to graduation and, along with the parents, helps make a decision.

It is obvious that this kind of "vocational guidance" only superficially orients the kids toward the choice of a particular specialty. Teachers are well aware of the pupils' psychological characteristics, interests, and level of development of moral and mental qualities, but they are not adequately acquainted with various trades and the system of worker training, nor are they always well-informed about the needs and requirements of production or future cadre requirements. For this reason, their recommendations often have not the slightest substantial importance for the adolescents.

Girls and boys are more willing to go to enterprises that they have become acquainted with while in school. Every vocation has its own characteristics based on its content and particularities. And who better than the workers themselves can tell of the difficulties and the attractive aspects of each vocation and focus attention on the qualities by which it is possible to judge one's suitability for it?

The Moscow Motor Vehicle Plant imeni Leninskiy Komsomol, for example, has organized a whole series of "labor talks" with dozens of schools in the City's Volgogradskiy, Zhdanovskiy, and Lyublinskiy rayons. They include meetings between pupils and labor veterans, young workers, foremen, and teachers of the plant's PTU. Pupils of the sponsored schools are invited to ceremonies of worker dedication, celebrations of attainment of majority, and inductions into the ranks of the Soviet Army. The kids have collaborated with the motor vehicle plant workers in the construction of a sports complex and a Palace of Culture. The best Komsomol-youth brigades undertake sponsorship of graduating classes and conduct joint Komsomol rallies.

Of course, the framework of the "sponsoring enterprise--school" link-up is always inadequate for vocational guidance work on the required level: it is confined to trades practiced in the particular plant, factory, or construction project. The interests of the national economy are not taken fully into account with respect to the abilities and inclinations of the pupils.

Only through the joint efforts of school and PTU collectives and representatives of the base plants and factories who are well-acquainted with the conditions of today's production will it be possible to shape the kids' vocational direction, provide the necessary information about the appropriate specialties, and expose them in practice (by the "sample" method) to the content of the labor.

Up to now, unfortunately, the secondary schools lack continuity in imparting labor skills to pupils in the first through eighth grades and in the concluding phase of instruction. Most pupils in the upper grades have to start virtually from scratch in the UPKs. Yet, the younger pupils crave to make something with their own hands, to try their skills at various trades. This favorable period in the development of labor skills, however, all too frequently goes unused.

Meanwhile, observation tours could be arranged for the PTU's lower grades in their own workshops, training shops, and work rooms and in the base enterprises, and Pioneer "Glory to Labor" and "Our Parents' Trades" assemblies and matinees could be held, and so on. It would be worthwhile, starting with the fifth grade, to acquaint the pupils with the basic technological processes and the content of the labor of the workers in the base enterprise, also to arrange meetings with expert production workers who graduated from PTUs, conduct open work lessons in the workshops of these schools, and so on.

Good prospects are opened up by the organization of labor instruction for the schoolchildren based in the PTUs. This makes it possible for the adolescents to get better acquainted with the life and efforts of the school's collective, and the characteristics of training in many specialties; it helps form an idea about the worker's and kolkhoznik's labor and teaches respect for it. Excellent use is being made, for example, of the material base of L'vov's Secondary Agriculture PTU No 1 to train pupils in Secondary School No 1 to be tractor operators. Questions of theory are studied in the classes, while practical and laboratory work is conducted in the school by the PTUs' foremen and teachers. This kind of collaboration makes it possible to make more effective use of the schools' training-material base, spread the PTU and schoolteachers' workload more evenly, and improve the practical links between general education and production training.

The Leningrad Gorkom has set up a coordination council coordinating the youth vocational guidance work in all rayons of the city. It approves regulations, recommendations, and methodological directives, organizes control over the publication of reference materials concerning the key trades, publicizes the various specialties by means of the press, radio, and television, reviews proposals and commentary on how to improve vocational guidance, and recruits specialists to organize it. Vocational guidance offices and centers provide the schools with information concerning the enterprises' various specialty requirements and consult with the pupils and their parents. The House of Culture belonging to the various plants and companies prepare children's concerts for the little ones to acquaint them with the world of vocations. Sometimes the PTU and school collectives conduct joint teacher councils, seminars, and conferences dealing with particular problems of vocational

guidance. Their purpose is to coordinate joint activities and help the pupils make the correct choice of specialty. Sometimes former schoolchildren who failed to get into a VUZ view this as a personal tragedy and consider the job they have taken to be something random and temporary and, as a consequence, perform unwillingly and poorly. This is the kind of situation that requires careful explanation work. Teachers and senior students of Leningrad's VUZs consult with those who fail the entrance exams and advise them where to go to work. Experience has shown that today's secondary-school graduate, with proper guidance, will in most cases remain faithful to his chosen specialty. In 1981, for example, Glavleningradstroy hired young workers sent by the mining and construction engineering institutes; clinics, hospitals, and medical schools took in girls and boys sent by the medical VUZs.

Other examples could be cited in which secondary school and PTU pupils have taken part in vocational mastery competitions, conducted excursions and sports contests, and are working together in technical circles, also cases in which it is not an occasional but a regular event for a teacher to come to the PTU or a foreman to come to the school. Nevertheless, such links, unfortunately, are not as yet distinguished by the required depth and scale. Sometimes the teachers attempt to foist the vocational guidance work off onto the schools where, in turn, they think that the UPKs are botching the job. But is a 10th grader in fact going to go to a technical school for a year or 1.5 years when enterprises will gladly take on someone who has obtained second-category rating in a UPK? Most, of course, will immediately go to work at a plant or factory. It is not difficult, after all, to convince an adolescent that he has already mastered his specialty. It soon becomes clear, however, that despite having received his "hasty" rating he cannot do a fully competent job on modern equipment and objectively falls into the category of second-rate production worker. This bothers him, of course, so he tries to pull himself up, sometimes knocks costly machinery out of commission, and turns out substandard products. As a result, his attitude deteriorates and he becomes disillusioned with his chosen profession.

What is necessary, obviously, is to revise the approach to the evaluation of UPK performance in terms of the number of ratings awarded and issue qualifications certification only to the most capable pupils who have acquired all the necessary skills and passed the PTU examinations. It is advisable, clearly, to shorten the term of instruction on a nationwide scale in the technical schools for all those who have undergone labor training in a UPK. In Moscow at the present time the training-production combines have technical schools assigned to them whose foremen conduct groups enrolled in the UPKs (assuming the appropriate profile of labor instruction). They observe upper-grade pupils at work for a year or a year and a half and provide vocational guidance to the specific pupils who manifest a desire to master the trade and who have the necessary prerequisites. Fundamentally, this is the correct course. Through joint efforts it is possible to instill in the adolescents a lively interest in the particular specialty and go on to organize in the technical school groups of accelerated instruction and turn kids who have a good general education into qualified worker cadres in 6 months or even sometimes 4 or 5 months.

So far, unfortunately, methodological guides have yet to be prepared which would concretely determine the content and continuity of the vocational guidance in all these links and the basic stages of the elementary, middle, and senior grades of the public schools. Frequently professional guidance is taken up by random people who conduct their efforts on an "amateur level," confining their work basically to vocational propaganda. Several years ago the public education departments introduced a staff slot for inspector in charge of labor upbringing and vocational guidance, but here again specialists are a rarity. The teachers schools are not turning out specialists of this profile.

In the cities, PTUs, many enterprises, VUZs and technicums are involved in the vocational guidance of schoolchildren. Each one has its own approach to problems of publicizing the various trades and a different understanding of the economy's requirements. Departmental discoordination frequently puts up artificial barriers, reduces work effectiveness, and makes it impossible to formulate uniform criteria. The time has come to create a vocational guidance service for adolescents on a republic-wide scale and determine its juridical status, rights, and duties.

K. Marx considered that a mistake in choosing one's vocation was tantamount to a personal tragedy. The creation of a system of vocational guidance for schoolchildren, in conjunction with improved labor training and ideological-moral upbringing, will make it possible to provide conditions for a more rational choice of specialty in accordance with one's calling, capabilities, education, and the needs of the economy.

The Basis of a Vocation

An increasingly greater proportion of the contemporary worker's activities is intellectual labor, the rationalization of technological processes. The worker can act independently only when he can see the fundamental interconnections in the production process. This requires a wide variety of general and specialized knowledge. Yet it is very difficult for novices to acquire such knowledge right in the enterprises. Because of their narrow technical scope, as a rule, they carry out only a few particular operations and fail to master related jobs. They find it difficult to learn to operate new equipment. As we know, machine-tool operators trained in short courses produce substandard products more frequently than do the graduates of the PTUs. A worker trained on the job or in a UPK requires considerably more time to master the qualifications than does the product of a school.

For this reason, girls and boys are increasingly convinced on the basis of their own experience and the experience of their comrades that if they intend to become top-rated workers capable of operating complex modern equipment they must learn their chosen jobs beforehand. In 1976 less than one-fifth of the eighth-grade graduates of the public schools entered PTUs; in 1981 it was almost one-third. Of those finishing the 10-year school, 15 and over 30 percent, respectively, entered the technical schools--that is, almost one-

third. Overall, the vocational-technical education system trained 4.8 million workers in the 7th Five-Year Plan, 7.1 million in the 8th, 9.5 million in the 9th, and 12.5 million in the 10th.

In the near future, the proportion of qualified workers in the national economy should approach 90 percent of the total as against 69 percent at present. Already nearly 60 percent of the trades require lengthy stationary training, a complete secondary education, and 6 to 12 months of workplace specialization.

One of the most important measures taking account of these tendencies is the conversion of the PTUs into schools which enable young people on completing the eighth grade to acquire a secondary education and qualification in the most complicated trades. In the preceding five-year plan the number of graduates of such schools nearly tripled. This process is complete in Moscow, Leningrad and Leningrad Oblast, Georgia, Kirghizia, and Estonia. The "Main Directions of Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1981-1985 and the Period Through 1990" calls for increasing the training of these specialists by another 1.6 times.

The main characteristic of such vocational schools is the organic link with the base enterprises, which makes it possible for the young people and the cadre workers to be together on a daily basis where the mature workers can influence the younger. In addition, the mastery of a trade and scientific principles is a single training-educational process there. Public school subjects (which are taught at the secondary-school level) not only serve as the basis for learning specialized disciplines but also help to improve the vocational training of the pupils. And, conversely, the study of specialized subjects helps to reinforce their knowledge of physics, chemistry, and mathematics.

Up to 10 percent of the PTU graduates who have earned grades of excellent and good can immediately submit documents to the VUZs without having worked the customary 3 years in enterprises. It would seem advisable to confer certain advantages on all the graduates of the secondary PTUs as long as they enter VUZs of related profile. The VUZs could only gain from such practice. Even if a person were to acquire the machine-tool operator's specialty, for example, and then become a technologist after completing the institute, he would choose this latter trade more deliberately, and the knowledge and production skills he acquired in school would help him become a qualified specialist more quickly.

In recent years the network of secondary PTUs outfitted with modern training-production workshops, proving grounds, and equipment for carrying out practical studies has been expanded substantially. The mass PTUs have been completely converted to secondary PTUs based in ferrous metallurgy, coal, chemistry, petroleum refining, and radio electronics enterprises.

This process, nevertheless, is not proceeding rapidly enough in all cases. There are only a very few secondary PTUs, for example, in railroad transport, machine building, and construction. The various ministries and departments

have not been including new schools (together with cultural and consumer service buildings) among the top-priority complexes of enterprises under construction, so that they go into operation much later than the main facilities. During the 10th Five-Year Plan only one-third of the planned schools went into operation in Azerbaijan and not more than two-thirds of them in Kazakhstan and Kirghizia. Not enough of them are being built by the gas industry, maritime fleet, and instrument-making, automation, and control systems ministries. The training base of the PTUs in rural areas is being built up much too slowly. Many of them are outfitted with obsolete equipment and training aids, and more than 300 have no training facilities at all.

It is also worthwhile to focus on questions of the formation of PTU pupil contingents. Although enrollment plans in the country's secondary PTUs are largely fulfilled every year (sometimes selection by competition is necessary), some of the graduates don't get hired. This happens because schools in a number of trades (those that are more attractive to applicants) enroll more adolescents than are necessary, to the detriment of other specialties. Having to report to the oblast vocational education administrations only for the total enrollment, they bear no responsibility for accepting the "wrong" specialties.

Consider, for example, the concrete worker's trade. Statistics show that very few wish to take it up. Ufa PTU No 6 resolved the problem in an original way--formally they trained operators of machines rolling reinforced concrete panels, even though the base enterprise needed only five or six specialists of that type. Nevertheless, they set up several groups to train the operators, even though everyone was well aware that graduates working off the mandatory 3 years would end up as concrete workers.

Yet training for such simple jobs does not require PTUs--all it takes is a short course or on-the-job training. This is not only more beneficial to society but also more honest in dealing with the students. Of course, in order to ensure that yesterday's schoolboys, now involved in work requiring the use of extremely simple mechanisms and tools, even primarily monotonous manual labor, can see prospects for growth, it is essential to create conditions for constant learning and professional advancement. Such a system, in particular, is functioning at the Volga Motor Vehicle Plant, where youngsters' plans are constantly revised for the future. Some are raised in grade, others receive additional pay for mastering related jobs, and still others are sent to learn new and more complicated jobs. The plant also has a rabfak [workers faculty], where young workers are trained on the recommendation of the collectives and the social organizations. Having passed examinations, they are given plant scholarships to the Togliatti Polytechnical Institute.

As for PTUs providing a secondary education, and technical schools, their graduates should obviously be assigned to the enterprises not just in general but to specific workplaces. The practice in Leningrad provides an example of this. Some 53 schools there have drawn up direct and multilateral agreements with 123 enterprises to train qualified workers for them. The pupils undergo production training in the plants, factories, shops, and brigades where they

will end up working, thereby learning the traditions of the collective. This has a marked effect on their ideological and moral training and helps to keep new workers in the enterprises. In the past two five-year plans, the Leningrad PTUs have trained over 0.5 million highly qualified workers.

The planning organs, as we know, are aware of how many tons of steel must be produced annually, and of what grades, how many pairs of shoes and of what sizes. Why not have the same kind of apportionment for future worker cadres? If each base enterprise would calculate and inform the school in advance not only about its needs with respect to graduates of particular specialties but also about the grade at which they could be hired, it would be much easier to solve the problem.

Life itself shows that local planning organs, working out enrollment plans for PTUs or secondary specialized schools, have practically no knowledge of how many youngsters will be enrolling in the various department schools, short courses, and various kinds of training combines, and what specialties they will take up. The sectorial ministries, in turn, when drawing up enrollment plans in department schools and technicums take no account of the number of eighth and ninth-grade graduates. The time has come to draw up uniform plans for the assignment of public school graduates, taking account of the future trade to be acquired, the cadre requirements of the specific economic regions, and to coordinate the enrollment of girls and boys in training institutions and their hiring in the enterprises.

As we know, the level of instruction in some PTUs is not very high, which accounts for the students' mediocre knowledge and poor vocational skills. Only 17.7 percent of future production workers earn good and excellent marks in public school subjects. In the schools of a number of republics, krays, and oblasts there are too many unexcused absences, and the dropout rate is high. This is why it is urgently necessary to improve the training-upbringing process and enhance the quality of instruction and education of young workers.

By and large, unfortunately, upbringing work is the weakest link in the training process. Many PTU teachers confine themselves just to imparting vocational-technical skills, forgetting the party's cardinal requirement of the unity of ideological, moral, and labor upbringing. The first two components of this requirement are frequently omitted from their purview. And the labor training itself is often understood in a one-sided manner. Too little time is devoted to the revolutionary and labor traditions of the working class, the imparting of class consciousness. This is detrimental. Officials of the vocational-technical training system must focus more attention on this aspect of the matter both in drawing up training programs and in selecting teacher cadres. The party and Komsomol organizations of the enterprises sponsoring the schools must not lose sight of this aspect of the matter.

An important role in this is assigned to the teacher cadres. More than 90 percent of the workers in the vocational education system now are degree-holding specialists. The quality of preparation of production training foremen, however, still remains an acute problem. The main source for their

replenishment is the industrial-pedagogical technicum (at present they take mostly the best graduates of the PTUs and technical schools who already have vocational experience) and the VUZs. In the past 10 years, the number of production training foremen having a higher or a secondary specialized education has doubled. Almost 20,000 young specialists entered the PTUs in 1981 alone. Nevertheless, there is still a shortage of experienced foremen.

In his "Memoirs," Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev had some warm comments for the cadre workers who help youngsters master their first trade, teach them the difficult science of life, and show them the spiritual beauty of the men of labor. Now, well-known leaders in labor are becoming production training foremen in the PTUs.

In the past few years, more than 700 experienced production workers have entered the PTUs of Leningrad. They include Twice Hero of Socialist Labor A. P. Mikhalev, a mechanic in the Izhorskiy Zavod Association, Twice Hero of Socialist Labor V. A. Smirnov, a shipbuilder, and Hero of Socialist Labor S. I. Il'in, a steelworker. In 1981 about 400 qualified specialists of the base enterprises of Moldavia became production training foremen. Every year the schools' base enterprises send almost 10,000 production leaders to work in the vocational schools.

Naturally, PTU foremen, called upon to serve not only as "transmitters" of vocational skills but also as educators, sometimes find it difficult to acquire the necessary pedagogical experience. Universities of pedagogical knowledge, courses in youth psychology, and problems seminars have now been set up for them. Altay and Stavropol' krais, Vitebsk Oblast, Latvia, and the Udmurt ASSR have widely instituted the practice of assigning foremen to temporary duty in leading enterprises for subsequent certification. In Moscow, many PTU workers have completed the evening university of Marxism-Leninism.

The education of youngsters to prepare them for work after completing school is also carried out within the production collectives. The beginning of one's labor career is a complicated stage in the life of young people. They need to be able to work a full shift at their machines and adapt themselves to "adult" standards. But the main thing, again, is that they need to be able to study. It is essential that new workers, running up against the difficulties of life on their own, not lose their youthful fervor, their desire to work actively. As a result of insufficient attention to the needs of young people, almost half of the girls and boys in industrial enterprises and on construction projects, and about 30 percent of those in the countryside, change jobs every year. Officials of associations, plants and factories, and Komsomol committees must pay close attention to what happens to the PTU graduates and see to it that everyone finds his place in the labor collective and stays there. More and more frequently, mentors are helping girls and boys to become confident of their abilities. Not just a few enthusiasts but hundreds of thousands of workers and kolkhozniks, labor veterans, and specialists of all sectors of the national economy are taking active part in this noble effort.

A number of enterprises have worked out special adaptation systems. At the Ufa Plant imeni S. M. Kirov, in particular, newcomers on the job are the object of special attention for 2 or 3 months. Each one is given excellent tools and new equipment. The collective determines whether the young worker likes his job or not, what relations he has developed with his workmates and the shop foreman, whether he is mastering his trade, and whether he is satisfied with the pay. When the youngster achieves his first accomplishment, it is made known not only to the collective but also to his family. During the adaptation period, newcomers are guaranteed minimum earnings of 100 to 120 rubles. They receive benefits in obtaining a place in the plant's boarding-house and in the clinic. In the first year, to ensure that they will master their trade and enter the labor collective as rapidly as possible, the young workers are not required to participate in subsidiary and other auxiliary work.

The labor collective's interest in the life of the girls and boys that have come to work, timely practical help and good advice, the creation of a favorable microclimate, construction of hotel-type dormitories, exposure to scientific-technical creativity, the use of time-tested rituals (worker dedication, ceremonial awarding of grade, first payday, tools engraved with the owner's name, and so on), and joint leisure activities--all of these foster the newcomers' successful adaptation to production and, consequently, enhance their labor effectiveness.

The upbringing of young people is the cause of the party and the whole state. A precise system of training for mature labor in the schools, PTUs, and technical schools, and ideological, moral, and labor upbringing in the production collective constitute tasks of vital importance to the national economy. To help boys and girls gain the momentum which will lift them to the heights of knowledge and vocational skill is the duty of party and social organizations called upon to impart to them the labor and life experience of the older generation.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

ONE ONE-THOUSANDTH OF THE COUNTRY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 84-94

[A social-economic study by Candidate of Philosophical Sciences V. Shustikov]

[Text] Tens of millions of people are now taking part in drafting and implementing plans of social development of labor collectives. With each passing year, more and more attention is being focused on the sociology, aesthetics, and psychology of labor, the theory of culture, in the enterprises and institutions, on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Abundant experience in the social development of collectives has been accumulated, in particular, in the city of Orsk, Orenburg Oblast.

We frequently use the expression: a part of our motherland, a part of our country. In Orsk this expression takes on tangible meaning. The number of its inhabitants (256,000) and the size of the party organization (17,800) are equal exactly to one one-thousandth of the population of the Soviet Union and the membership of the CPSU.

Orsk was one of the first in the country to meet 10th Five-Year Plan targets in regard to the growth of labor productivity and product sales. The workers of Orsk gave their homeland considerable amounts of above-plan products--equipment for blast furnaces, rolling mills, large-load tractor trailers, stack movers, nickel, gasoline, furniture, clothing, and items made of Orsk's famed jasper.

The meticulous, purposeful efforts of the city's party and other social organizations and labor collectives, aimed at developing the economy, go hand in hand with a concern to create favorable social conditions for most of the inhabitants.

The CPSU Central Committee Decree "The Orsk Gorkom's Implementation of the Integrated Resolution of Matters of Ideological-Upbringing Work" (1977) gives a high assessment of the Orsk workers' completion of the tasks of economic and social development and communist upbringing of the working people. The Orsk Gorkom is utilizing new findings of social scientists in the field of social planning and seeking out effective forms of social organization, which are being polished and perfected in the process of implementing the workers' proposals.

Innovation and Scale

Walking about the grounds of the Orsk Tractor Trailer Plant, with its numerous buildings, and down the aisles of its shops, it is hard to believe that not very long ago there was nothing but wasteland here on the high banks of the Kumachka.

It is characteristic of our times that the plant's administration and cadres were being formed during the construction process itself. Open trenches still yawned, and on the site of the future shops the steel reinforcement rods were just beginning to rise up, while not far from the entrance to the huge site they stuck an unprepossessing office with a sign on it reading "Management of the Future Plant."

While drawing up the collective's social development plan, the management incorporated in it an item that was unusual at first glance: to start producing trailers ... several years before the enterprise was officially opened. This idea was firmly supported at the construction workers' party meetings.

A trackside warehouse for finished products was converted into a custom equipment shop, where they began to master the production of new items. What they set up was like a plant in miniature, a kind of proving ground for the completed production cycle. There they began to turn out full-fledged trailers with automatic unloading, electric circuits, and hydraulic components. As new buildings were completed, operations--now on a considerably larger scale--were moved into them. One after another, the bluish-grey trailers left the shops, the capacity of which increased rapidly. By the time the plant was officially opened, these shops had turned out 20,000 trailers. But there was another important aspect, one which is difficult to state in figures. A collective was being shaped, doing real work, testing its capabilities in the handling of difficult tasks.

The construction of a settlement, a boiler facility, heating conduits, and roads went into full swing. Along with the building of the shops they erected a kitchen facility, hothouses, a livestock-fattening complex, and several open feedlots.

At the point where the Kumachka empties into the Ural they allotted a tract of land for collective orchards. A road was built to it, and water lines were laid. More than 1,000 of the plant's workers now go there to relax with their families.

As the construction progressed, circles and sports sections came into being: a chess club was started, a motorball team was organized, also a sambo [unarmed combat] section, and the voices of amateur performing artists and agitation speakers began to be heard....

The plant went into operation ahead of schedule, on the eve of 1981. An energetic, technically skilled collective, tested in concrete, large-scale production tasks, entered the shops as their rightful masters. "The CPSU

Central Committee is pleased to learn of the ahead-of-schedule completion of construction and delivery for operation of the first phase of a plant to produce 25,000 tractor trailers per year," wrote Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his telegram of congratulations to all who took part in the gigantic project. "... Simultaneously with the construction of the plant the enterprise's workers produced more than 20,000 trailers. Very important, also, is the fact that apartment buildings and social-consumer facilities were built in complex with the production buildings."

During the construction process they also resolved the very important task of organizing constant upgrading of the educational level of the workers, their professional skills. The social development plan provided for mass instruction of the workers in second and third trades, also creative business trips to exchange experience. The educational level is taken into account when totaling up the results of competition. And this has yielded results: in the past 5 years the workers' average has risen from a grade equivalent of 8.1 to 11. Raising their educational level, the people grow themselves.

Aleksandr Mikhaylovich Vasilenko is 28 years old. He worked as a carpenter on the plant's construction and went to school. Since completing the technicum he has for 2 years now been manager of a shop employing 300 workers.

Vasilenko is no exception. Hundreds of other managers in the enterprise are still of Komsomol age. The term "veteran" in this youthful collective is quite relative. V. D. Chernov, director of the plant's museum, showed me a display testimonial to veterans Vasiliy Petrovich Dubov, a lathe operator, and his wife Natal'ya Vasil'yevna, a painter. And their combined age is only 50 years--even if you add in their little daughter....

The plant workers' high educational and professional level enables them to handle increasingly difficult tasks. Not long ago an assembly workers' brigade headed by A. V. Strokin approached in full strength--16 in all--the shop's economist and asked him how much output had to be produced by the end of the 11th Five-Year Plan.

Learning that production was to more than triple, the assemblers inquired as to how many workers this would require. Much more than at present, it turned out, even taking planned productivity increases into account.

"But wouldn't it be possible to achieve the increase with the same personnel?" asked the assembly workers.

The economist could only shrug his shoulders.... Then the whole brigade started calculating. They sought out reserves along many lines: improved technology, reduced work time losses, placement of cadres. The administration also lent a hand.

"Strokin really started something!" said P. V. Atamanitsyn when I asked him how things were going in the brigade. "You have to consider that there is no foolproof procedure. How to find the golden mean so that the brigade benefits but production does not suffer? And it takes precision: other brigades

are about to take up the initiative. Everyone is seeking reserves. We are counting on our foremen."

"As a leader, the foreman must know his people very well, be a psychologist, taking account of age and individual differences among the workers. He must be ideologically mature and have a good technical and psychological education"--these words are quoted from the Orsk plant's social development plan.

The title "tracing-holder" sounds a little awkward, to be sure, but it is an honorable one. Generally, only the veteran plants hold it. But the Orsk Tractor Trailer Plant earned it even before being commissioned. It means that from now on the USSR's technical policies in manufacturing tractor trailers will be determined and controlled by this young enterprise.

In Older Plants

The Construction Machinery Plant cannot compare in scale with the Tractor Trailer Plant: it only has 1,500 workers. It was built, moreover, during the war, when no one thought about conveniences. Even within these old walls, however, there is the bustling energy of social transformations.

... A lone wayfarer stands before a mountain ridge, snow-filled ravines, looming snowdrifts. One seems to hear the sound of water from under the snow. But it is only the roar of machine tools. Because the waterfall, the ravines, and the mountain ridge are just murals on the wall of the production facility.

"When the mural was completed," says Viktor Sevast'yanovich Shtern, chief of mechanical shop No 2, "it was immediately apparent that the other three walls were not finished. The collective set about to rectify the situation: they organized a subbotnik and fixed them up. Then it became noticeable that the floors were dark ... that wouldn't do. They removed the asphalt and laid down light-colored mosaic tiles, so that the shop now looks completely different--bright and clean."

To be honest, the first steps didn't come easily. Many workers got used to the work conditions, not even noticing that the shops were trashy and the windows sooty. The fact that the roof was deteriorating was mentioned in each discussion of the collective agreement. And all statements that in time the shops would get machine tools of the latest design, the work would become more creative, and the premises would be laid out in accordance with the latest standards of technical aesthetics, were met with smiles.

Finally the sketches for the shop layouts were placed on the desk of the plant's director, V. I. Yerastov. With the help of the party organization, he incorporated the work of enhancing the quality of operations within the precise framework of the plan. Every Tuesday at 11 o'clock, the section chiefs reported on what had been done that week.

In shop No 2, several machines were moved onto new shock-absorber mounts. At the workers' suggestion, their layout was altered so that one person could

operate a number of machines more conveniently. In shop No 3 they installed elegant plastic cabinets in the employee service facilities and decorated them with relief work expertly done by electric welder I. K. Os'kin. He also made a symbolic panel: a flying carpet--one of man's ancient dreams--and cosmonauts flying into outer space--our own dream come true.

"Red corners" were set up in the shops by the workmen themselves. A new and more spacious dining room and three snack bars were built. It came time to replace the roof, and streams of sunlight poured into the shops. In a few years the plant was transformed.

But the first impetus to change came from the undivided interest manifested by the collective toward matters of labor aesthetics. The collective got increasingly interested in lectures of the "Labor and Aesthetics" cycle, in books on aesthetic upbringing. In time they gained a deeper understanding of the processes to be carried out. The people were concerned not only with how the shop or section looked outwardly but also whether the design met current standards, what kind of relations, ideally, should prevail in the lowest-level production collective. These and other matters increasingly became the subject of discussion at party meetings and party committee sessions. Labor upbringing was correlated increasingly with aesthetic concerns. Efforts against shortcomings in the organization of labor were stepped up. The collective's microclimate also changed.

The problems also revealed themselves in greater detail--from major ones down to, for example, where to get a specialist in labor aesthetics and what slot to assign him to? Should the larger shops, perhaps, have a staff artist? By what standards can one measure the level of production aesthetics?

Workers are awaiting solutions to these problems in other Orsk enterprises, where much is also being done in the field of labor aesthetics, in handling social problems.

... The smelting shop of the Nickel Combine. The electric furnaces seethe and bubble. In these huge "samovars" the semifinished product is converted into pure nickel. Smelter worker Aleksey Timofeyevich Vedekhin, a delegate to the 26th CPSU Congress, picks up several dull-colored drops of hardened metal. It is hard to believe that they contain such strength: mix them with steel, and its strength increases.

The shop was built before the war. And, naturally, the subject of working conditions comes up, how the plant's social development plan will help to improve them.

"The way it was before," says Vedekhin, "you'd put out your hand and it would come back black with dust. And the drafts were something terrible...."

In the creation of good hygienic conditions in the combine, a major role is played by the medical engineering brigades. These are new social organs that came into being in the social planning process here in the Southern Urals. The brigade includes chief specialists, mechanics, metallurgists, builders,

shop physicians of course, and health office representatives. The nature of the sickness rate is analyzed, and proposals are made as to how to reduce it. Sometimes this involves reequipping the facilities and the introduction of new, more hygienic technological processes. Thus, on the recommendation and with the participation of the medical engineering brigade the glass blocks in the sintering shop were replaced with window glass, which improved lighting. In a number of workplaces, walls were placed between the machine compartment and the control panel.

Working conditions for the blower operators also were improved.

"Before, I had a broom in my hands all the time," says operator T. I. Larionova. "Now it's all done hydraulically."

Recently the combine collaborated with representatives of the Academy of the National Economy USSR on a study of the social-professional structure of small and auxiliary collectives engaged in manual labor, followed by an inventory of all manual labor. In doing so, of course, they proceeded on the basis of workers' suggestions. They drew up documents characterizing the manual labor in each trade and, on this basis, made 988 charts of manual operations. They worked out an integrated target program to upgrade the level of mechanization and reduce manual labor. It called for remodeling the production facilities, using the combine's own manpower, and building automated warehouses.

These measures resulted in the release of 378 workers formerly involved in manual labor. The economic effect in a 5-year period came to more than 1 million rubles. In the 11th 5-year period, plans call for extensive utilization of transport and hoisting devices and advanced repair materials.

... One of the enterprises submitted to the gorsoviet the proposal to shift the city's future downtown several kilometers south, onto the left bank of the Ural.

"But the project has already been approved," the gorsoviet objected, "and no one is about to redo it...."

"The project planners failed to note that the city of Novotroitsk and some new settlements will rise up close by. And our proposal is fully substantiated ..."

So they did shift the city's center! Construction has been halted on the old plan, and the geodesists are already working on Zaural'naya Roshcha, where the future center of Orsk will be built.

A detailed system of social-economic indicators has been worked out in Orsk. The half-year performance of each collective is assessed by a special authoritative commission, after which the results are tallied for the trust as a whole. It also takes account of the level of organization of competition, the production accomplishments of the enterprise, the quality of instruction in night schools and the technicums, and whether workers are

mastering related jobs or not. It takes into account the labor collectives' enhanced role in residential upbringing work, in organizing family recreation days and collective attendance at the theater, and the status of amateur arts activities. The social aspects of the collective's development are evaluated just as meticulously as are economic indicators. And in the collectives the workers themselves see to it that participation in the relays is maintained in all positions.

"That's just what happened in the Ferroconcrete Products Plant," says V. N. Savchenko, deputy chairman of Orsk's Leninskiy Rayispolkom. "The social-economic indicators system includes item No 18--artistic creativity. But the enterprise's officials decided not to enter a team, pleading that their people were too shy.... Imagine their astonishment, then, when hundreds of workers expressed a desire to take part in amateur arts activities during the relay drive! They discovered they had metal-chasing artists, woodcarvers, and needlepoint experts, to say nothing of scarf weavers. And the culinary exhibit exceeded all expectations. The final evening, when the relay baton was passed on, 100 persons took part. How's that for shy!"

The people of Orsk also deserve much credit for the fact that close attention is paid to matters of social development everywhere you go.

... Secondary School No 11 was filled with delegations--the first day, directors of instruction; the next day, specialist teachers visited open classes; this was followed by a series of Pioneer leaders.

It is an ordinary school--a typical three-story building staffed like other schools are. But the approach to the vocational guidance of the pupils is genuinely creative. Consider, for example, meetings with the graduates of GPTU [City Vocational-Technical School] No 1. Young men and women who have acquired specialties chat with their former school comrades and discuss the details of their particular trade. What does a lathe operator have to know, what demands are placed on him, and does a crane operator need to know physics? The graduates talk about their jobs with unconcealed pride: and why not, for in their hands the worker's vocation is additional evidence of his secondary education!

The school has instituted the fine tradition of conducting communist subbotniks jointly with their sponsoring workers. And each time, the subbotnik is a genuine labor celebration. There are songs and slogans, the highly interesting work in the shop, having a glass of tea in the workers' dining room, in which a grizzled labor veteran and an eighth grader who just joined the Komsomol may sit side by side.

In the corridor on the second floor, next to classroom 8-A, is a large portrait of Shakir Baktybayevich Zhumatayev, a lathe operator who is one of the best workers at Yuzhuralmash. A Cavalier of the Order of Glory Third Degree and winner of three medals "For Valor," he has been working now more than 30 years in the same enterprise. It was there that he became a virtuoso machine operator and was awarded the title Hero of Socialist Labor. Permanent competition has been instituted in the school for the possession of the

Zhumatayev Prize, awarded by Shakir Baktybayevich himself. It is a cherished honor. And winning it is not easy. It is not enough to study hard--the student has to supervise the younger pupils and carry out extracurricular labor assignments in an exemplary manner (such as work in the children's library, in the mailroom, or in the kindergarten).

The school's vocational guidance office has a collection of information about 300 trades, practically all the ones you will find in Orsk. There is information about which kinds of specialists work in which plants, information about the work of the lathe operator, the technology engineer, the gear cutter, teacher, nurse....

School director L. I. Panova told me, for example, about an interesting debate that was held on the topic "The History of Socialist Competition." Each class entered a team. Questions followed one after another. And some of them couldn't be called easy ones. When was the first subbotnik held in Orsk? Who headed the first front-line brigade, and where does the brigade leader work now? Who was entrusted with welding the first beam in the Metal Structures Plant, and when did it take place?

The school's museum of the history of socialist competition has a large frame--1 x 1.5 meters--holding photographs of Stakhanovites of the prewar period, the first woman engineer, and the first shock worker of communist labor in Orsk. Secondary School No 11 preserves this material carefully.

The Organizational Aspect of the Matter

In the years since the CPSU Central Committee adopted the decree "The Orsk Gorkom's Implementation of the Integrated Resolution of Matters of Ideological-Upbringing Work," the city has made new steps toward intensifying economic and social development, in particular the ideological-political, labor, and moral upbringing of the people, shaping their active life position. This has resulted primarily from the purposeful efforts of the party and social organizations and the mass information and propaganda media.

There is an active city veterans organization, which is highly respected in Orsk. The purpose of its raids is to analyze the various aspects of upbringing work in the collectives. In addition to its leaders, whose activities are being discussed, the organization's meetings are also attended by invited representatives of the administrations of other enterprises. A. M. Mal'tsev, chairman of the group, told me about the heated discussion of an inspection of the dormitory facilities of Yuzhuralmash conducted by staff members A. V. Kolontayeva and M. P. Ryakhina. The measures that were mapped out helped to change the situation for the better in all the city's dormitories. Fruitful discussions were also held concerning the work of the militia's juvenile offices as well as the Pioneers House in the older part of the city.

Considerable organizational work is being done by the gorkom with regard to implementing social development plans. Scientists from Moscow and other major cities have come to help the gorkom. The social development plans of the Nickel Combine, the Tractor Trailer Plant, and other enterprises call for

measures to improve interpersonal relations in the collectives, and much attention is focused on shaping an active life position and inculcating political culture and class consciousness. Many of these measures are being vigorously implemented.

The propagandizing of economic, political, and psychological-pedagogical knowledge is being conducted in a purposeful manner in Orsk. It is actively participated in by teachers from the pedagogical institute and lecturers of the city's Znaniye Society. Lecturers from Orenburg frequently appear. A large group of scientists from the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Sociological Research came to Orsk, also representatives from a number of central scientific institutions, to hold meetings with party officials.

The city's university of Marxism-Leninism awakens its students' interest in problems relating to the social development of the labor collectives. A course in social psychology has been given there several years now. To be sure, the program has had to be altered somewhat. The concluding theme, "Methods of Social-Psychology Research," has been moved to the middle of the course. It was done so that the students could make practical use of the methods recommended by the program.

Practical workers should not have to take a purely theoretical course in social psychology, in the opinion of Candidate of Psychological Sciences M. R. Druzhinin, a teacher in the Orsk branch of the Orenburg Obkom's university of Marxism-Leninism. In their course work the students should carry out practical research in social psychology, right in the collectives where they work. For example, on the basis of "The Psychological Characteristics of the Collective" they conduct a questionnaire survey followed by generalization of their observations in a "Practicum for Social Psychology." There are hundreds of such works.

"This kind of practical research in social psychology is also valuable for those working in small collectives," says Yu. P. Trubachenko, chief engineer in one of the departments of the Fundamentproyekt Institute. "It was a revelation to me, in particular, when in investigating interpersonal relations in one of the subunits I found that its leader was not respected. The collective discussed the matter a number of times, but it was never brought out into the open. Now the unit is headed by G. A. Mineyev, who was formerly a rank-and-file engineer."

It should hardly be necessary to argue how important it is to take up new, advanced developments, to foster and promote them. In the Ferroconcrete Products Plant and in Construction Administration No 1, where the collectives are now seriously involved in matters of social development, socialist competition has become more effective; this has had a marked effect on labor productivity, which has risen faster than the plan calls for. Cadre turnover has declined, absenteeism has been reduced, and losses of work time due to in-shift idleness are lower. For the first time in many years these collectives are no longer among the laggards.

What is a labor, training, culture, and sports relay?

A new, effective organizational form has come into being, fusing many disparate elements of the social organization of labor collectives. The moral and material incentives for competition participants have become more effective. More attention is paid to whether a person is doing well in his studies and mastering additional jobs, whether he is involved in physical culture and learning to appreciate spiritual values. The actual facts of social development are all brought into focus. And those aspects which had been considered secondary take on new meaning. And one more factor: the social development of the collective is undergoing, so to speak, social inspection.

This experience has been thoroughly analyzed in the gorkom and recommended to other collectives. Account has been taken of the fact that the enterprises differ from one another both in terms of the nature of production and in the degree of development of the components of social organization. In order to ensure comparability of results, alternative point assessments have been determined for each of the 19 indicators drawn up in the labor collectives.

The gorkom's methods office proposed conducting a labor, training, culture, and sports relay primarily between related enterprises so that construction workers, for example, could compare themselves against other construction workers, metallurgists could compare themselves with their colleagues, and so on. Nor were the communications offices, dining facilities, and libraries left out. Relay-inspections of all the collectives were organized in the rayons, and then between them. Now the methods office has collected hundreds of report albums reflecting how the relays stand both within the collectives and between collectives of related sectors of industry, between enterprises in the rayons and between rayons of the city. These reports provide abundant experience of the social creativity of thousands and thousands of people in Orsk. And this experience is not just gathering dust on library shelves--it is being actively utilized by propagandists and enterprise officials, by everyone who is concerned about how to disseminate and improve the experience.

It has become the rule in Orsk for city officials to give an account of themselves before enterprise workers and inhabitants of the various districts. At these meetings, organized by a strict schedule, not a single comment is ignored. Considerable interest was evoked by an Open Letter Day which the gorkom conducted at one of the city's largest enterprises--Yuzhuralmash. Nearly a month was spent preparing for the event. A considerable number of the questions were known about beforehand, and the gorkom asked the most competent officials to answer them. Another important factor is that Gorkom First Secretary G. V. Krivyakov and Gorispolkom Chairman V. A. Tomin conducted the meeting. Many questions were given precise, definite answers on the spot, and deadlines for resolving them were set.

The Experience of the Best to All

Orsk's scientific potential is not large. To resolve many social problems the city requires the qualified help of oblast, republic, and all-union

scientific institutions. It also seems that a much greater contribution to this matter could be made by the ministries, especially those which have not yet become involved in social development plans on a sectorial scale.

Advanced experience in the social organization of labor collectives has been accumulated in many cities of the country--Tiraspol, Sterlitamak, and Bobruysk, to say nothing of the larger centers. It has not, however, been adequately studied as yet. There are only a few thousand degree-holding psychologists in the country. There are even fewer degree-holding sociologists and specialists in labor aesthetics. It is obviously wrong to hope that the problem of cadres of this profile will be solved in the next few years. In our opinion, therefore, we ought to focus more attention on seeing to it that future engineers, mechanics, and technologists in the VUZs master the skills of new scientific spheres such as labor aesthetics, theory of culture, and engineering and economic psychology.

A useful initiative was undertaken recently by the USSR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, the USSR Ministry of Education, and the USSR Higher Certification Commission, which discussed the state of psychological-pedagogical research in the country at a joint meeting. It was noted that there are not many theoretical works generalizing substantial practical material. This situation needs to be corrected.

The advanced social experience of many cities and labor collectives goes unused for years on end. For example, the collective of the Lyubertsy Carpet Combine has for some time successfully implemented psychologists' recommendations on the organization of competition, but this experience has not been widely adopted. Similar experience at the Volga Motor Vehicle Plant has been known for 10 years now, but no one is adopting it.

To help in the adoption of advanced elements of social organization is also a prime task of party organizations and scientists. For example, why not generalize these new elements, acquired both by scientific and practical efforts, and offer them to the various plants--taking account, of course, of the social maturity of each of them? It would be possible to set up an associated sociological model such as "The Socialist Enterprise" or "The Socialist City," which would generalize and reflect achievements in the field of social planning of enterprises and applied aspects of knowledge. It would also be possible to take into account the tendencies of development of the fundamental sciences.

This is a scientific task of great importance. Use could be made of substantial fundamental undertakings in sociology, labor aesthetics, theory of culture, social psychology, and sectors of psychology closely linked to the natural and technical sciences--engineering psychology, psychophysics, psychophysiology, and so on.

To work out this model it would be worthwhile to set up an integrated group made up of scientific colleagues from institutions of the USSR Academy of Sciences as well as sector academies and scientific-research institutes, also representatives of leading enterprises. This kind of group composition would

make it possible to elucidate the various aspects of new phenomena in life, as scientists were called upon to do at the 26th CPSU Congress.

Let us suppose that such a scientific organization were to be approached for consultation by a representative from Orsk (or Kutaisi, Morshansk, Belebey, or some other city), and asked for help in assimilating new elements of social organization tested at some enterprise or other. The scientific colleagues would determine the degree of maturity of the social organization of the particular collective: does it have social passports, how well-developed are the enterprise's sociological services, does it have even the rudiments of a psychological service, and so on? Having determined the necessary factors, the scientists would offer some particular alternative social organization of the collective or the city as a whole and recommend which specialist might be of assistance in adopting it. Of course, the workers of such a scientific institution would have a hard time keeping up--the flow of new and progressive developments in social organization is substantial even now, and in time, when universal attention is focused on social factors, it will increase even more.

What has been accomplished is already usable, of course. Quite successful, for example, is the organizational form of collaboration between the USSR Academy of Sciences and the AUCCTU. The membership of the Scientific Council on Problems of Socialist Revolution of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the AUCCTU includes scientists and practical workers. The council's efforts to generalize practical achievements, disseminate advanced experience, and work out fundamental theoretical problems of socialist competition have been quite fruitful. And the USSR Academy of Sciences History Department has a Commission for the Utilization of Data of the Historical Sciences for the Practice of Economic Construction in the USSR, which has also accumulated substantial experience.

The labor collectives, production, and social practice as a whole require more precisely formulated methods of integrated utilization of all sectors of the social sciences, including psychology, sociology, scientific communism, economics, philosophy, and aesthetics. Such an integrated approach to the matter will provide an operative scientific basis for the resolution of urgent problems of social development. It will give the Central Statistical Administration, USSR Gosplan, and the party organizations a scientifically verified system of indicators of social development in collectives, a system which is so urgently needed everywhere.

Everyone has plenty to do--sociologists, philosophers, and specialists in scientific communism. Consider, for example, social psychology. How much more effective the dissemination of advanced production and social experience could be if it were not conducted on intuition alone but on the basis of precise scientific findings taking into account such psychological categories as persuasion, suggestion, character, and habits.

What kinds of findings of psychological science can be reflected in concrete recommendations for inclusion in the social development plan of a collective or sector? We do not yet have satisfactory answers to these questions. It

is essential to expand fundamental research along these lines, to formulate precise methodological principles of applied research and ultimately conduct this research in a scientifically rigorous manner which is at the same time comprehensible to the officials of the enterprises themselves. It is also necessary, obviously, to encourage executives more actively to master the principles of social psychology.

The system of party instruction and evening universities of Marxism-Leninism could help a great deal. There are problems here as well, however. There is as yet no textbook on social psychology for such universities, although the need for one is acute. In social psychology generally there are practically no guidelines with respect to themes for which the students have a special need: "Social-Psychological Problems of Ideological-Upbringing Activities," "Social-Psychological Principles of Administration," "Social-Psychological Aspects of Propaganda." And it is obviously time to include labor aesthetics in the programs of Marxism-Leninism universities.

Despite certain deficiencies, science has something to say in this. The task is to be able to translate what has been achieved from the language of high science to the language of practicality. Social practice has the right to expect more substantial aid from the country's leading institutes, especially the institutions of the USSR Academy of Sciences and the union republic academies of sciences, ministries and departments, and educational institutions, especially such schools as the Leningrad Institute of Social-Economic Problems, the universities of Leningrad, Yaroslavl, Moscow, and Tbilisi, which are training cadres of social psychologists and sociologists.

The Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences has passed a decree on working out the scientific principles of a national psychological service. This effort should be conducted more intensively, for the creation of such a service is a matter of vital importance.

Social planning is indeed undertaking increasingly complex tasks. And problems of optimizing the social life of the production collective cannot be resolved without the support of scientific accomplishments.

... A small part of our motherland. We hear these words often. Here in Orsk, this figurative expression is filled with profound meaning. Orsk is one one-thousandth of the country. All the more typical, then, are the problems the people of Orsk have to face, and the experience they have accumulated.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY, STATE SYSTEM, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 95-106

[Article by KOMMUNIST Collective Correspondent USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of State and Law]

[Text] Problems of socialist democracy, of its steady strengthening and improvement, are at the center of attention of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This is convincingly attested by the party's multifaceted theoretical and practical activities, the decisions made in recent years at party congresses and CPSU Central Committee plenums, and the adoption of new constitutions of the USSR, the union republics, and the autonomous republics. Powerful, creative stimuli to the further elaboration of Soviet socialist democracy are provided by the documents of the 26th CPSU Congress.

The party follows consistently Lenin's statement that "triumphant socialism is impossible without full democracy ..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 27, p 253). A solid foundation for the theory and practice of people's rule is provided by the unfading ideas of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, according to whom democracy is a political, class concept. Touching upon problems of socialist democracy, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized: "The key point for us in this has been and will continue to be that which the word democracy literally means--namely, people's rule, participation by the masses in handling state and social affairs, the genuine people's self-government of which V. I. Lenin spoke."

The experience of the USSR and the practice of the fraternal countries have incontrovertibly demonstrated the reality and fruitfulness of socialist democracy. Genuine people's rule--the rule of the soviets--has brought about the liquidation of man's exploitation by man, an upsurge of social production and the well-being of the masses, unprecedented flourishing of their culture--in short, it has created the necessary prerequisites for the all-round development of each member of society. This is manifested concretely in the steady improvement of the working and living conditions of millions of working people from year to year, from five-year plan to five-year plan, in the growth of their political and labor involvement, level of education, and civic awareness and initiative.

Among the gains of Soviet democracy is the realization of not just the de jure but also the de facto equality of all nations and nationalities of

the country. Observing the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR, they are justly proud of the social, economic, and cultural heights they have attained in the framework of the unified, truly democratic and fraternal internationalist community that constitutes the Soviet people.

Such an unprecedented, pioneering effort as the creation of socialist democracy, of course, was no easy and simple matter. In our path we encountered many difficulties and sufferings. Some of them were due to objective factors --the sharp class struggle, the stubborn resistance of the exploiting classes, capitalist encirclement, and the hostile policies of most of the bourgeois states. Among other consequences, this also entailed certain restrictions on democracy with regard to the nonproletarian elements, a move the party made deliberately, seeing them as unavoidable and at the same time not forgetting their temporary, transitional nature. With the foundations of socialism laid, in the mid-1930s restrictions on political rights and freedoms were lifted. Of quite different character were the difficulties conditioned by subjective factors--manifestations of the cult of personality and the resulting violations of democracy and legality. These deviations from Leninist norms of party and state life have been successfully overcome by our party and our people.

The CPSU realistically appraises the complex problems of consolidating the new social system and, as was pointed out at the 26th congress, continues to work steadfastly to perfect socialist democracy, creating the material and ideological conditions necessary for this. The party clearly directs communists and all the Soviet people to carefully preserve and enrich the time-tested, fruitful Leninist principles of people's rule.

It must be emphasized that the CPSU's approach to problems of democracy is characterized by careful, comprehensive consideration of the experience of the other socialist countries. As we know, this experience was utilized in drafting the 1977 USSR Constitution. This was possible because the main directions of elaboration of socialist democracy reflect the general laws governing socialist construction.

It is necessary to return again and again to these matters because the theory and practice of Soviet socialist democracy are being subjected to ferocious attacks both by the blatant opponents of the very idea of socialism and by various kinds of "proponents" of it who are inclined to discredit the actually existing socialism that has already been built, ascribing to it a "total bureaucratization of political relations."

I

The prime and probably most important fundamental question is the relationship between the state and society under socialism. This, it might be said, is the key question in methodological and political relations.

The founding principles of the socialist state system are formulated in a number of classic works of Marxism-Leninism. These include "The Communist Manifesto," "Critique of the Gotha Program," "The Civil War in France,"

"Anti-Duering," "The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State," "The State and Revolution," and "The Children's Disease 'Leftism' in Communism." Of priceless value are Lenin's practical experience in the post of leader of the Soviet state and his speeches, articles, and commentaries relating to that period.

The utterances of a number of foreign authors pretending to contribute to Marxist theory are, to say the least, divergent from the fundamental postulates substantiated by Marx, Engels, and Lenin. They dismiss without justification the experience of many socialist countries, pinning on them the label "statist-bureaucratic socialism." They deliberately oppose to it the "emancipatory and humanistic potential of self-government." In this way, they proclaim self-government to be the antithesis of "statization," by which they mean any state involvement in economic and other spheres of the life of society.

Quoting selectively and out of context from the classics of Marxism-Leninism, the adherents of this kind of opposition attempt to show that under socialism the state is inevitably transformed into a force which goes against society and the masses and pursues its own narrowly egotistical ends. This danger is supposed to derive from the fact that the state's professional apparatus inevitably moves out from under the control of the people and the elected organs of authority, transforming itself into a closed bureaucratic and technocratic elite standing above society and manipulating it. Self-government is declared to be the sole means of overcoming bureaucratism and technocratism, of effective state-free resolution of virtually all complex problems of social administration.

What can be said in this regard? Attention is drawn, first of all, to the quite arbitrary attitude toward the theoretical heritage of Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

As we know, they occupied a negative and sharply critical position with regard to the bourgeois state, which defends the foundations of the exploitative system and is profoundly hostile to the interests and needs of the working people. But Marxism-Leninism can in no way be equated with anarchistic views and ideas. The victorious revolutionary working class and its allies had to build their own socialist state, which for the first time in history expressed the will of the majority of working people. It is a state of a new historical type. It does not represent a force in opposition to society but rather, as the authors of the "Communist Manifesto" envisioned, the proletariat, organized as the ruling class (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 4, p 446).

Lenin specially emphasized the fundamental newness and creative character of the socialist state, its genuinely democratic nature--democratic in a new way (for the proletariat and the dispossessed in general) and dictatorial in a new way (against the bourgeoisie) (op. cit., vol 33, p 35).

Coming into being as the basic tool of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the new state immediately distinguishes itself from the old not only because

of its class essence and the tasks it faces but also by its method of operation. For the first time in history it is based primarily on persuasion, organization, and incentive, it works out and conducts its policies on a broad democratic basis. At the same time, the socialist state must have the possibility of applying coercion to those who violate the will--elevated to the status of law--of the ruling class. This, in particular, reflects--although substantially altered--the traits and principles specifically characteristic of the state in the life activities of the socialist system. They are objectively essential for the precise and reliable fostering of the interests of society, for protection of the social groups and individual citizens that make it up against any and all arbitrary rule. By now this is more than merely the rudiments of Marxism--it is the living practice of the socialist countries.

~~altered--the t~~
The social base of the state of the new type does not remain unchanged. It expands as the new structure is consolidated, as the level of maturity of socialism rises. Along with changes in the class structure of society, an enormous role is played by actual processes of the socialization of production, the rise in ideological-political consciousness, and the growing material well-being and general culture of the masses. The key factor in strengthening socialist democracy is the political course of the party of Lenin, spearheading social development and fostering its ties with the masses, its ability to lead them, inspire them, and organize them for conscious, creative participation in all political and social life.

Of historic significance is the process of the USSR's transition from a state of the dictatorship of the proletariat to a state of the whole people. It is the direct successor and continuer of the dictatorship of the proletariat; its motive force continues to be the working class, whose fundamental interests, ideology, and end goals are shared by our whole society. Through its systematic, goal-directed efforts the state of the whole people promotes the eradication of social distinctions and progress toward full social homogeneity. The resolution of such truly historic tasks is possible only through comprehensive, energetic elaboration of its economic-organizational and cultural-educational functions.

At the 26th CPSU Congress it was stated that the classless structure of society will come by and large within the historical framework of mature socialism. This will undoubtedly involve one more major step on the path toward strengthening the unity of the socialist society and the development of the state of the whole people.

The liquidation of essential social distinctions, followed by the transition to distribution according to need, will mark the advent of the highest phase of the communist social-economic formation. And only then will the state organization of society, methods of social administration specific to the state, become no longer internally necessary, only then can the state wither away, as the classics of Marxism-Leninism eloquently put it. The condition for this will be the attainment of abundance not only in material but also spiritual production, the education of the fully-rounded, collectivist human being, harmonizing his needs and abilities with the needs of society.

Naturally, the final withering away of the state will also require the creation of the appropriate international conditions.

Such, in brief, are the basic Marxist-Leninist postulates characterizing the role and place of the state in a socialist society. They are ignored or interpreted in a distorted and one-sided manner by those who take a position of denying or underrating the positive significance of the state under socialism.

There are some critics of genuine socialism who claim that under Lenin the development of Soviet society proceeded along the path of self-government, and after his death the ideas and practice of self-government were forgotten. In reality, however, the situation is quite otherwise.

Lenin never placed the socialist state and self-government in opposition to one another. He emphasized the popular character of the new state system, the role of the soviets, which became the political basis of the state, and he exerted considerable effort to create a precisely functioning state mechanism manned with highly qualified, professional cadres.

Lenin defined the course of development of the Soviet state as the broadest political organization of the masses, functioning on the principles of genuine people's rule. Under mature socialism, these principles have been revealed in all their fullness, corresponding to new social possibilities and requirements. The USSR Constitution emphasizes that all power in the country belongs to the people. The people exercise state power through the soviets of people's deputies, which constitute the political basis of the USSR (Article 2). This is in full accordance with Lenin's directive: "... The people, united by the soviets--that's who must administer the state" (op. cit., vol 31, p 188).

To the soviets are elected representatives of all classes and social groups, all nations and nationalities, and all generations of working people. Thus, among the deputies to local soviets workers constitute 44.3 percent, kolkhozniks 24.9 percent, CPSU members and candidates 42.8 percent, nonmembers 57.2 percent, women 50.1 percent, and young people up to the age of 30--34.0 percent.

But it is more than just a matter of the representative character of the soviets, now numbering 2.3 million deputies (and this figure rises many times over if the aktiv of the soviets is taken into account: for deputies and state agency workers receive constant help, on a voluntary basis, from more than 31 million citizens). Of great importance is the systematic renovation of their makeup (in each election, about half of the deputies elected are new), thanks to which in the last 2 decades alone more than 20 million persons have gained systematic practice in state administration. The work of the deputies is increasingly monitored by their constituents; an effective instrument in the hands of the electors is the right to recall deputies who have not justified the trust placed in them.

The general direction of development of the Soviet state entails enhancing the role and expanding the powers of the soviets, strengthening the democratic principles of their organization and endeavors. This results in substantially strengthening the soviets' regulating influence on the processes of the economic, political, social, and ideological-spiritual life of society.

The adoption of the 1977 USSR Constitution launched a new stage in the work of the soviets of people's deputies, distinguished by a rising intensiveness.

The USSR Supreme Soviet and the supreme soviets of the union and autonomous republics have expanded their legislative endeavors, strengthened their control over law enforcement, and begun regularly to review the state of affairs in individual spheres of economy, culture, and national administration. A large number of laws have been enacted, including those governing the supreme soviets, laws concerning the USSR Council of Ministers and the councils of ministers of the union republics, citizenship, people's control, and law enforcement organs.

Strengthening the activities of the highest organs of administration, as was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, helps in the timely detection and elimination of shortcomings and elevates the general tone of state life. This exerts a palpable effect on the functioning of the whole state apparatus, especially the councils of ministers, ministries, and departments.

Exercising the new, broader powers conferred on them by the USSR Constitution, the local soviets have tangibly improved their work. In 1969 they reviewed and made decisions on 363,000 items; in 1981 the figure rose to over 869,000, and this increase was made up basically of questions relating to the economy and public social and cultural services. The soviets continue to focus much attention on the local economy, on public services, and at the same time serve as organizers of integrated economic and social development in their own districts. This has been facilitated by the expanded economic powers of the soviets, by improved territorial planning and administration in the economic sphere. The local soviets exercise control over the work of the enterprises and organizations located within their jurisdictions.

Special mention must be made of the public's active participation in the work of the soviets. It has become a rule in our life not only to hold public discussions on vital legislation of national importance but also for the working people to take part in the decision-making process of the local soviets. The soviets are forging increasingly strong ties with social organizations and labor collectives, and the institutions of direct democracy are playing an increasingly vital role. The strengthening of democratic principles in the work of the soviets is facilitated by the electors' mandates. At the time of the 1980 elections to the local soviets, 796,000 mandates were submitted to the organs of administration for action; as of 1 January 1982, more than three-quarters of them had been executed.

Considerable diversity and concreteness characterize the different forms of participation in administering state and social affairs, which are constantly utilized by the social organizations and organs of social initiative.

Membership in the social organizations enhances citizens' opportunities to take part in examining and resolving numerous political, economic, and social matters, to make suggestions, and to criticize shortcomings in the work of state and social organs and officials. Central and republic organs of social organizations have been given the right of legislative initiative, while trade union organizations also have the right to monitor the production performance of economic executives and their compliance with labor legislation. The Soviet trade unions, as was once more convincingly demonstrated at their 17th congress, serve as a school of communist management and administration for practically all workers. At the same time, they constitute an authoritative, inseparable link in the democratic political system of our society.

The trade unions issue decrees and other acts having to do with questions of labor protection, the examination of labor disputes in enterprises, the conclusion of collective agreements, and social insurance. Many important acts are passed by the state organs jointly with the trade unions and in consultation with them.

Protecting the rights and interests of the working people, the trade unions vigorously combat bureaucratic abuses of Soviet laws by officials. In 1979, for example, over 6,000 officials who had committed such violations had administrative charges filed against them at the initiative of the trade unions, and 146 of them were removed from their posts.

The system of people's control organs, in which state and social control operate in harmony, has been broadly strengthened in the Soviet state. People's control groups and posts elected at worker meetings--and they number about 10 million persons--are accountable to the labor collectives. Dealing with economic life and social-cultural construction, with the field of production and distribution, and the activities of the state apparatus, people's control has become a form of socialist democracy whose significance is increasing constantly.

It is becoming increasingly important to take account of public opinion. It is a kind of barometer providing timely signals about the state of affairs, about contradictions and conflicts arising in the process of social development. At the 26th CPSU Congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted that in order to strengthen the party's role of leadership it is essential to heed the voice of the masses, to resolutely combat manifestations of bureaucratism and voluntarism, to vigorously develop socialist democracy.

Our party pays much attention to the study of public opinion with regard to the most important problems of state and social life. The Soviet people have the opportunity to express their views and assessments, exercising freedom of speech not only at meetings and rallies but also in letters to the central party and state organs. In the years between the 25th and the 26th party congresses, the CPSU Central Committee received more than 3 million letters, and the Central Committee received almost 100,000 visitors. During that same period, local party organs reviewed 15 million written and oral declarations from citizens.

Socialist society, of course, is not immune to manifestations of bureaucratism. This danger was pointed out by Lenin himself. The history of Soviet rule clearly reveals how wrathfully he exposed bureaucratism, what decisive measures he proposed and implemented to get rid of this ill which causes immeasurable harm to the cause of socialism. Lenin never believed that with the triumph of the proletarian revolution society would immediately be free of bureaucratism. "It is possible to banish the czar, the landlords, and the capitalists. We have done this," he wrote. "But it is impossible to 'banish' bureaucratism...." (op. cit., vol 52, p 193). Lenin emphasized repeatedly that the complete liquidation of bureaucratism is a lengthy process requiring the constant attention of the communist party and decisive struggle against this evil.

As we know, the social soil that nourishes bureaucratism is, primarily, the antagonistic class structure of an exploitative society, the random development of distribution of labor with its blatant gaps between the material and cultural standards of living of the individual social groups and strata of society. By eliminating such distinctions and liquidating class antagonisms, socialism also gets rid of the fundamental social causes of bureaucratism. Bureaucratism is alien to the very nature of the socialist state system.

The causes of bureaucratic manifestations under socialism are to be found not in the class-political sphere, although in the early stages the inevitable class resistance to the new system may take bureaucratic forms, which are directly or indirectly directed against the revolutionary gains of the working people.

What factors, then, foster bureaucratism, hamper its eradication, and consequently require more attention from the party and society as a whole? They can be provisionally broken down into two groups, the first of which encompasses shortcomings of a structural-functional nature, imperfections in the organization of state administration, and insufficient control by the masses over the activities of officials; the second is in the sphere of social psychology, and relates to shortcomings in ideological-educational work. In real life, of course, these factors are by no means manifested in "pure form," they are interrelated and interdependent.

Our party is waging a constant and decisive struggle against bureaucratism. Consistent measures are being implemented to eradicate the causes of its rise and development. Strict punishment awaits those officials who take a perfunctory attitude toward their duties and to the lawful and just appeals of citizens. Constant improvement is being made in the system and methods of administration, in its legal foundations. Recently, for example, the transition has been made to a two- and three-link system of administration in the national economy, its structure is being simplified, and duplicate and superfluous administrative links are being eliminated. Greater responsibility is assigned to the ministries and departments for the proper and economical expenditure of funds on administration. Strengthened people's control over the performance of the state administrative apparatus is of enormous importance. These goals are also served by efforts to achieve close harmony between professionalism and mass participation in administration, to make

maximally rational use of the social organizations' abilities and powers of control.

The communist party, the soviets of people's deputies, and the public at large are making great efforts to perfect the socialist state system, to decisively eliminate from our life all manifestations that are in conflict with the principles of socialist democratism and communist morality.

It would be a dangerous error, however, to assume that under socialism the state itself becomes the source of bureaucratic and other negative phenomena. This point has to be brought up because it is precisely this thesis which is frequently set forth by some foreign theoreticians in various kinds of pseudoscientific and at times blatantly demagogic forms. In this connection mention should be made of another vital consideration. Practice has shown that bureaucratism and formalism, the opposition of individual and group interests to social concerns, and isolation from the interests of the people are possible not only in state institutions but also--and to no less a degree --in organs of social self-government, especially when its autonomy becomes exaggerated and overly emphasized.

The way to eliminate bureaucratism is not to remove the socialist state from the sphere of administering the affairs of society but to ensure increasingly broad and more direct, competent, effective participation by society's members in the organization and activities of the state, a well-developed system of democratic control. It is of especially vital importance, moreover, to enhance the political and legal culture of the masses, to develop the skills and techniques of democratic administration, and to strengthen people's control over the work of the state apparatus. It is the communists above all who are called upon at all times to set a personal example in all this multifaceted effort, which requires high principles, self-criticism, fervent dedication, and responsibility. This is what the Communist Party of the Soviet Union demands of its members.

II

Let us turn to the question of self-government. It is not new to Marxism-Leninism and our party. The theory and practice of development of socialism determine its place in the system of democratic administration on the basis of analysis of actual social conditions, accumulated experience, and social needs.

The Marxist idea of self-government of workers free of exploitation was advanced from the very beginning in Lenin's works and party documents, considering it one of the most important principles of socialist and communist construction. It is characteristic that the second Party Program, adopted at the Eighth RCP(b) Congress, states in particular that under Soviet democracy, which transformed the soviets--mass organizations of classes oppressed by capitalism, the proletariat, and the poorest semiproletarian peasants, that is, the great majority of the population--into the permanent and sole basis of the whole state apparatus from bottom to top, our state implemented the ideas of self-government in a form incomparably broader than anywhere else.

"It is the task of the party," the program states, "to carry out tireless efforts to fully implement in practice this highest type of democratism, which requires for its correct functioning constant raising of the level of culture, organization, and initiative of the masses" ("KPSS v Rezolyutsiyakh i Resheniyakh S'yezdov, Konferentsiy i Plenumov TsK" [The CPSU in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences, and Central Committee Plenums]. Moscow, 1970. Vol 2, p 42).

The party's programmed stipulations concerning self-government are now juridically formulated in the preamble to the USSR Constitution, which proclaims: "The highest goal of the Soviet state is the construction of a classless communist society in which social communist self-government will be developed." Movement toward this goal is not for the remote future; it is everyday practice, consistently making its way in our daily life.

The present time has witnessed the development of an apparently paradoxical situation in which this Marxist-Leninist idea is often completely distorted and utilized to discredit the experience of socialist democracy in the USSR and a number of other fraternal countries. The slogans of self-government are brought to the forefront of polemics as a kind of counterweight, an alternative to the path along which our countries are moving. It is symptomatic that the blatant enemies of Poland, including counterrevolutionary provocateurs among the "experts" of "Solidarity" and their imperialist sponsors, have plotted their attacks against genuine socialism on the basis of an opposition between the socialist state structure and social self-government.

In essence, they are attempting to ascribe to the CPSU and the fraternal parties a negative attitude toward the very idea of self-government--an obvious falsification of the facts.

Thus, self-government is more than just a set of principles and institutions for the democratic administration of social and state affairs. It is also a widespread political slogan utilized by a variety of parties, organizations, movements, and leaders.

In examining the theoretical and practical aspects of self-government under socialism, it is necessary to keep in mind that this capacious concept has been used to characterize distinct social phenomena that are by no means identical. First, it is utilized with respect to full communism, meaning a system of communist social self-government--that is, a future system of administration which will replace the socialist state system. Second, self-government is mentioned in cases which refer to the broad autonomy and independence of localities with respect to the center in contemporary state organization, primarily as applied to local representative organs of state rule. Third, self-government is present in social organizations and labor collectives within the limits defined by the bylaws or by the appropriate legislative acts. Fourth, self-government refers to the mechanism of administering the affairs of society and the state, coinciding in its basic parameters with the political system of socialist society. This is the broadest interpretation of self-government with respect to socialism.

The socialist state, as has been emphasized, is an organization of the working masses themselves. In this sense, administration of the state and society as exercised by the working people themselves is nothing less than genuine people's self-government (V. I. Lenin, op. cit., vol 34, p 316). To ensure that the socialist state really expresses the will of the working people, a system of relations between the state and the nongovernmental organizations of the working people has been formulated from the very beginning. Especially with the guiding force of the new society--the Marxist-Leninist party of the working class--as well as with trade union and other social units. The political system of socialism makes it possible, when exercising state authority, also to take account of and harmonize the interests of the different classes and strata of the working people both among themselves and with the common interests of the whole people.

With the triumph of the socialist revolution, a continuous process of elaboration of the political system's democratism has been perfected. This takes place by expanding the masses' participation in state administration, the introduction of social principles in the activities of the state apparatus, enhancing the role of the social organizations, in particular the transfer to them of certain functions of the state organs, and also by perfecting the forms of direct democracy at the various levels of administration, especially in the labor collectives and the low-level administrative-territorial units.

It must be emphasized, nevertheless, that under socialism, as experience shows, administration as a whole must necessarily be based on the correlation of state and social principles, although the relationship between them, of course, is not identical either during specific stages of development of the society or on its different levels. On the village level, for example, many more problems of administration can be resolved by purely social methods and means than, for instance, on the oblast level. The same thing is true in production: whereas a brigade can itself handle many of its production and social problems without having to appeal to the enterprise's administration, on the basis of self-monitoring and self-organization, the effective administration of a sector of the national economy requires professional organs--the ministries and committees; it requires the constant, systematic application of governmentally organized forms of activities which, of course, does not exclude the public's active participation in this sphere.

Systematic expansion of democracy on all levels of administration is one of the regular laws governing the perfection of socialism's political system. Various forms of practical participation in administration in this country encompass tens of millions of persons, yet we are far from thinking that we have done everything possible in this sphere. The CPSU, the Soviet state, and our whole society are striving to accomplish the task Lenin set forth--to ensure that every citizen takes part in administration and that this participation is constant. To this goal is subordinated the whole thrust of the development of Soviet socialist democracy, as stipulated in Article 9 of the USSR Constitution: perfection of the state apparatus, increase in the involvement of the social organizations, strengthening of people's control, strengthening of the legal foundations of state and social life, expanded openness, and constant regard for public opinion.

The process of development of socialist democracy does not follow the path of mechanical abolition of the institutions of the state or some arbitrary weakening of its role in social life but on the basis of the full disclosure and utilization of the potential embodied in it. Under socialism, people's rule cannot be exercised outside of state forms; it is inevitably of a state-social character. It is methodologically groundless, therefore, to place the socialist state system in opposition to social self-government: they form a dialectical unity and complement one another.

Now a few words about the relationship between self-government and democratic centralism. In examining this matter it is necessary to keep in mind that the principle of democratic centralism organically incorporates the idea of local self-government and the independence of low-level production units. Let us recall Lenin's well-known statement: "Democratic centralism, far from excluding local self-government and the autonomy of regions distinguished by specific economic conditions and way of life, by the specific national makeup of the population, and so on, in fact requires both the one and the other" (op. cit., vol 24, p 144).

It is hardly necessary to argue that the individual territorial units that go to make up the state cannot be on a fully equal footing with the state, which represents all the working people of the country, the whole nation. The interests of such territorial formations and the society as a whole relate as the part to the whole. Collective and group interests may not coincide either among themselves or with the interests of the nation as a whole; various kinds of contradictions may arise. In the event of such conflicts, preference in the process of administration must be given to the interests of the nation as a whole. Any other approach would lead to serious disorganization of the administration of the state and society.

Democracy's development under mature socialism, and further enhancement of the working people's cultural standards, logically lead toward expansion of the principles of social self-government, especially in production. Soviet laws and their practical application create enormous scope for the energetic initiative of the labor collectives and enable them to fully manifest their independence and resourcefulness.

One effective form of broad participation by Soviet citizens in administering production, a way for them to exert an active influence on the performance of the labor collectives, is that of the permanent production conferences. At present our country has more than 140,000 production conferences, in which 6 million elected persons serve. Every year they submit about 1.5 million proposals whose implementation enhances the effectiveness of production, improves working conditions, and yields millions in economic effect. Participation in these bodies instills in the working people a sense of being the master of production, and enhances their skills in administrative activities.

The strengthening of democracy in the production sphere is inseparably linked to the introduction of collective forms of labor organization and wages in accordance with the end result. The brigade method has brought about new organizational forms of self-government--brigade assemblies, brigade councils, and brigade leader councils--that are not decreed "from above" but come

"from below." These organs of the primary labor collectives take active part in organizing the production process, in the selection and assignment of cadres in the brigade, and deal with matters of moral and material incentive.

We see, then, that the state's administration of the economy, and the communist party's concern for economic development, do not represent a one-sided course toward exclusively centralized handling of all matters in the organization of production and management. The party points to the necessity of expanding the rights and independence of the local organs, enterprises, and organizations, of raising their initiative, developing socialist resourcefulness and responsibility.

A certain amount of decentralization of the administration of the nation's property is an objective necessity: it is impossible to plan everything from one center. But decentralization of the administration of the economy is not unlimited; it has its qualitative limits. Any other approach would entail, in essence, fragmentation and liquidation of the common national ownership, transforming it into group ownership, with all the resulting consequences that would weaken and undermine socialism. It is no accident that anti-socialist forces, acting under the slogan of "genuine self-government," have impelled Poland's economy along just such a path of unrestricted decentralization, removing enterprises from under the control of the socialist state.

The Soviet Union is presently working out and implementing a system of measures designed to further improve the mechanism of economic management. It involves raising the level of planning, strengthening the day-to-day independence of the associations and enterprises, and making concrete the constitutional principles defining the rights of labor collectives. Undoubtedly, all of this will serve to foster the increasingly effective correlation of state and social principles in the chief sphere of human endeavor--social production--as well as other aspects of the multifaceted life of the Soviet people.

Thus, contemporary Soviet practice not only acknowledges but systematically develops the principles of self-government--without, however, allowing them to come into opposition with the socialist state system.

The experience of our country and the other countries of socialism attests to the enormous creative potential of Lenin's principles of people's rule. The development of social self-government and optimalization of its correlation with state administration have been and continue to be one of the most important "resources" of democratism and social life. In the process of defining the stages, forms, and methods of development of self-government, naturally, a thoroughgoing study is made of practical needs and the objective "balance" between state and social concerns.

Rigorously guided by the general laws governing the construction of socialism and communism as discovered and substantiated by Marxism-Leninism and confirmed in the practice of a number of countries, the CPSU, the Soviet state, and our country's people are not imposing their views, experience, or any "models" of social life whatsoever on anyone else. "We do not believe,"

Comrade L. I. Brezhnev remarked at the 26th CPSU Congress, "that everything is ideal here. Socialism in the USSR was built under unbelievably difficult conditions. The party blazed the trail through unknown territory. No one knows better than us what difficulties and shortcomings we have encountered along this path, and what difficulties remain to be overcome. We are carefully attentive to comradely, constructive criticism. But we are decisively against any 'criticism' which distorts socialist reality and thereby deliberately or inadvertently serves imperialist propaganda and the class adversary."

Socialist democracy and the solidarity of the working class and all the working people around their guiding force--the party of Lenin, and the Soviet people's profound dedication to the magnificent internationalist legacies of the founders of Marxism-Leninism--these constitute the vital sources of the inexhaustible creative potential of the Soviet system, leading to ever more and newer accomplishments.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

FIFTEEN YEARS OF STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY AND PROGRESSIVE TRANSFORMATIONS
IN THE PDRY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 107-114

[Article by Ali Naser Mukhammed, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Yemen Socialist Party, chairman of the presidium of the supreme national council, prime minister of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen]

[Text] In recounting the independent revolutionary development of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen under the leadership of the Yemen Socialist Party, inspired by the ideas of scientific socialism and proletarian internationalism, it is necessary first of all to recall some outstanding historic events in the life of the Yemeni people. It includes the liquidation of British colonial domination in the southern part of Yemen, the winning of state independence and the proclamation on 30 November 1967 of an independent republic coming into being as a result of victory in the people's war waged in the course of the 14 October 1963 revolution under the leadership of the National Front for the Liberation of Occupied South Yemen.

To understand the various stages of the revolutionary development of our people and our country, it is essential to analyze the conditions and origins of the evolution of the Yemen patriotic movement.

First of all it must be pointed out that the 14 October revolution did not come about on a blank space. Its roots go back to the heritage of the national-liberation struggle, the fighting traditions of the Yemeni people and their patriotic movement. Nor was the 14 October revolution an event of merely local significance isolated from the processes taking place in the Arab national-liberation movement as a whole under the influence of the victory won by the Soviet Union over fascism in World War II and the formation of the world socialist system.

Starting in the 1950s, marked changes began to take place in the national-patriotic consciousness of our people under the influence of many internal and external factors. Among these factors was the unsuccessful coup of 1948, initiated by the "Free Yemeni" movement in North Yemen which struggled against the Imam's theocratic regime, the subsequent removal of the most eminent representatives of this movement to Aden, where they collaborated with advocates of reform to institute constitutional norms in the life of the country, the tragedy of Palestine, the 1952 revolution in Egypt under the

guidance of Gamel Abdel Nasser against imperialism, Zionism, and reaction and widely supported by the Arab peoples and, finally, the spread of the ideas of scientific socialism.

In analyzing the distinguishing features of the Yemeni patriotic movement, it is necessary to take account of all the above factors. The decisive factor, however, which had the main impact on its formation just as it did on mapping out its goals and founding principles, was the rise of the Yemeni working class, which joined the active political struggle and set up its own trade union association in 1956. It was this factor which brought it about that the patriotic movement acquired a new social base and brought about demands for the liquidation of colonial oppression, the removal of British troops, national independence, Yemeni unity, and social justice. In this political situation there arose an organized political force which became the successor to the most revolutionary currents of the Arab national-liberation movement in the form of the movement of Arab nationalists, the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party, and also the National-Democratic Union, which incorporated Marxist circles headed by the outstanding figure Abdalla Baazib. Along with these three leading patriotic factions there appeared in the country several reactionary and reformist political organizations and parties taking a conciliatory stance toward British colonialism and conducting policies that did not correspond to the Yemeni people's aspirations for liberation, sovereignty, unity, and progress in conditions of independent development.

At the height of resistance against colonialism and its henchmen, various forms of political and trade union activity were developed; the patriotic movement gained the broad support of the masses; traditions of organized struggle began to take shape; anticolonial acts by the peasantry became increasingly frequent. All of this was the concrete manifestation of the general upsurge experienced by the Arab national-liberation movement in the 1950s.

As a result of the revolution of 26 September 1962, the theocratic monarchic regime in North Yemen was overthrown, and the first republic on the Arabian Peninsula was formed. This event opened new prospects for an upsurge of the patriotic movement in South Yemen on the basis of close organizational links and shared aspirations and goals of the Yemeni patriotic movement in both parts of the country. It strengthened and united the patriotically inclined political organizations and drew thousands of working people from the south of the country into the ranks of defenders of the North Yemeni Republic. The unity of the national destinies of the whole Yemeni people, reflecting shared economic interests, similar social conditions, common customs, and also the historically developed ties of kinship of the population in both parts of Yemen, thus came brilliantly to the forefront. Various segments of the Yemeni patriotic movement rallied together on the basis of the joint struggle, which corresponded to the interests of both the Arab nationalists and the Baathists and Marxists. On the other hand, political groups arising on a separatist, local basis (the Aden Association, the League of Sons of South Arabia, and the People's Socialist Party) subsequently ceased to exist.

Such were the origins of the armed struggle against British colonialism, for independence and the creation of the National Front for the Liberation of Occupied South Yemen--a broad, mass organization including in its membership various political forces and social groups on the basis of a democratic program of national liberation. This had an increasing influence on the shaping of the revolutionary-democratic consciousness of the masses of the people in our country under concrete historical conditions characterized by a weak social involvement on the part of the working people as well as an inadequately developed cultural level.

The Yemeni patriotic movement waged the struggle both in the North and in the South. As to the revolution of 26 September 1962, its triumph and its defense were ensured by all segments of the patriotic movement mobilized into the ranks of the National Guard, which defended the North Yemeni Republic, and by thousands of workers and peasants from Aden. The ranks of our party even today include comrades who took part in the fighting north of the capital city of North Yemen against the gangs of reactionary Naymites, who were supported by imperialism and reaction and were utilized by them for subversive acts in an attempt to overthrow the republican system and restore the reactionary monarchical regime that had been swept away by the revolution.

Over the course of several months after the revolution of 26 September, direct preparations got under way in Sana for an armed uprising against British colonialism in the South. Meetings of representatives of various patriotic movements fighting against colonial oppression were held, in the course of which agreement was arrived at concerning the creation of a unified National Front (NF). At the same time, some of the patriotically inclined elements remained outside the front itself--agreeing, nevertheless, to maintain contacts with them in order to achieve further agreement on joint participation in the armed uprising.

Thus, the revolution of 26 September came to be one of the main factors prompting the initiation of the armed uprising in the South, in particular with regard to the training of insurgents and the stockpiling of weapons and ammunition. Considerable aid in this was provided by underground cells of various organizations included in the National Front and operating in Aden and other regions of South Yemen. Their accumulated experience made it possible to ensure successful training of the Fedayeen (partisans) in Aden, to organize the masses of people, and carry out work in the ranks of the trade unions and other social organizations as well as workers employed in serving units of the British army based in Aden, where the headquarters of the Middle Eastern Command and weapons warehouses were located.

With regard to its organization, the NF was shaped to some extent under the influence of the structure of the Movement of Arab Nationalists. In its endeavors, the Front relied more than other organizations on such party traditions as the holding of regular congresses, the precise elucidation of its goals and ideological-political stance, and observance of organizational principles. This enabled the NF to work actively among workers, peasants, soldiers, women, students, young people, and patriotically inclined intelligentsia. At the same time, its ranks included representatives of social

strata who were dissimilar in regard to class and ideology. During that period, however, the NF was more progressive than the other organizations involved in the armed uprising (for example, the League of Sons of South Arabia and the People's Socialist Party) and in the end joined forces with the colonizers and foreign reaction.

Spearheading the revolution of 14 October 1963 in South Yemen, the NF was able to rally around itself broad segments of the population, including the working people of the cities and villages, who found in its activities those things which responded to their interests and hopes, their aspirations for national liberation from colonial domination in the South and consolidation of the young republican system in the North.

Gradually we were able to overcome the difficulties and obstacles which confronted us in the beginning. It became clear that the long-awaited day was approaching when our people would win victory, accomplish progressive transformations, and resolve national and class problems. At the time the NF was created and the revolution began we were not many in number. But then we acquired the support of thousands of the sons and daughters of our people--workers, peasants, women, members of the intelligentsia, employees, and soldiers. This helped to promote progressive changes in the ideological-political platform of the NF and to extend its social base among the working masses. Just as the revolution was growing stronger through progressive elements, the reactionary and opportunistic groups, seeing that the NF's development went against their class interests and goals, suffered complete collapse.

In the social-political conditions taking shape in our country at that time, considerable aid in weakening and liquidating the numerous opportunistic elements which attached themselves to the revolution as it was getting started but were incapable of entering the ranks of such revolutionary organizations as the National Front, was provided by those who mapped out the destiny of the revolution and accomplished it in practice. Most of these people, who fought with weapons in their hands, were workers and peasants in origin or had been members of other laboring strata of the people.

Former members of feudal bourgeois circles, as well as various stripes of reformists and opportunists, proved to be incapable of keeping pace with the changes taking place in the ranks of the NF, of living and working with those who fought in the mountains, of sharing their hopes, believing in their ideas, and defending their interests.

As the revolution unfolded, important political changes and positive internal processes began to take place. They were manifested, in particular, in the fact that in the consciousness of most of the cadre workers of the NF and the fighters there was a growing awareness of the real essence of national liberation, the interconnection between political independence and economic independence and the accomplishment of progressive transformations in the interests of the working people.

One may say that the NF, despite its lack during that period of a clearly expressed striving to follow the theory of scientific socialism, played a vital patriotic role in the life of the people as an organization of democratic, revolutionary prospects fighting colonialism, reaction, and all reformist and opportunistic tendencies in the Yemeni national-liberation movement.

This was manifested not only in the matter of defending the revolution of 26 September 1962 against the intrigues and subversive actions of British colonialism and the sultans and in the triumph of national independence of South Yemen on 30 November 1967, but also in resolving democratic tasks in conditions of the country's independent existence, in decisive counteractions against opportunistic elements, and also in concrete social-economic and political transformations. The National Front proclaimed its adherence to the theory of scientific socialism and set about the task of creating a party of the Yemeni working class in collaboration with its allies--the National-Democratic Union and the People's Vanguard Party (formerly the Arab Socialist Renaissance Party). Just such a party was the Yemeni Socialist Party--the first such party on the Arabian Peninsula, the first party of the working class and its allies among the peasantry and other working strata to come to power in an Arab country.

It is important to note that the broad spectrum of forces making up the NF gave rise to serious conflicts which, however, were not manifested openly, for the prime and most acute problem that needed to be resolved was the struggle against colonialism and its henchmen. These contradictions, nevertheless, were reflected in ideological-political processes taking place within the NF and were manifested in broad debates concerning questions of how to develop the revolution further. These involved attitudes toward the "forced annexation" of the NF to the Liberation Front (FLOSI), which enabled a few puppets, opportunists, sectarians, sold-out politicians and reformists to fight their way to power and attempt to emasculate the anticolonial struggle, to strike a blow against the revolution of 14 October and compromise its goals. Under the influence of the debates in the ranks of the NF, the "forcible annexation" plot was broken up, the NF left the FLOSI, and the armed and political struggle of the masses of people was renewed, culminating on 30 November 1967 in the victory of our people under the leadership of the NF--the liquidation of colonial domination that had lasted almost 129 years and the birth of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen.

Revolutionary Activities Since Independence

Soon after the main task was accomplished--the successful struggle against colonialism and its henchmen and the winning of national independence--there was a new flareup of the discord that had been manifested in the course of the Fourth Congress that was convened in Zanzibar in March 1968. Right-wing forces headed by the former president of the republic, who had seized the leadership of the NF and the state, attempted to restrict the struggle to that which had already been accomplished in the course of the national-liberation revolution--that is, to formal political independence, ratification of a national flag and a national hymn. They opposed the progressive

wing of the NF, which called for undertaking to complete the process of national liberation. By this it meant liquidating the material and spiritual residues of colonialism, freeing the national economy from the combination of the monopolies and foreign banks, implementing thoroughgoing agrarian reform, freeing the peasants from semifeudal production relations, instituting democratic norms of life for the broad masses of the people, purging the armed forces to get rid of their reactionary leadership, organizing a progressive, genuine people's army, and strengthening ties with the Arab and international national-liberation movement and other forces of progress and socialism with the Soviet Union in the vanguard. The left wing also advocated the further organizational-ideological strengthening of the NF on the basis of improving its social structure, guided in this by the ideas of scientific socialism, which came to be increasingly widespread in the Arab world from the late 1960s.

The left wing of the National Front consolidated its position after the Fourth Congress and the adoption there of progressive decisions aimed at carrying out the tasks of the national-democratic stage of the revolution on the basis of the theory of scientific socialism and the implementation of radical revolutionary transformations in organizational-political, social-economic, ideological, and other spheres. The documents drawn up at that congress clearly express progressive and class-based directions.

In response to this, the right wing of the NF in alliance with the reactionary top military brass, revealing its ferocious hostility to the decisions of the congress, resorted to armed coercion. On 20 March 1968 there was an attempt at a reactionary putsch, which struck a blow at the principles of legality existing in the NF, halted the implementation of the decisions of the congress and the front's organizational activities, and instituted in the country an atmosphere of dictatorship and terror hostile to everything progressive.

In the situation, the left wing of the National Front launched a counter-attack, relying on low-level cells in the cities and villages, on the support of other mass social organizations and patriotic movements not part of the NF, and also progressive forces in the Arab countries and throughout the world. The left-wing forces waged an implacable, stubborn struggle against the right wing in power, utilizing all available methods and tactical techniques. This struggle ended triumphantly with the "cleansing movement" of 22 June 1969, which opened up broad prospects for the further development of the revolutionary process in the country. Soon after that all the necessary steps were taken to ensure successful implementation of the tasks of the national-democratic revolution. To that end, the NF established on a democratic basis close cooperation with the People's Democratic Union and the People's Vanguard Party, which in 1970 had declared its separation from Baathism and conversion to the position of scientific socialism. Measures were undertaken in the country that were revolutionary in content and designed to ensure economic growth, resolution of the land question in favor of the poorest peasantry, and democratization of education and culture so that they could be enjoyed by all the working people. Then the foundations of a system of justice were laid, guaranteeing the people's mass participation in the country's administration; a course of action was undertaken to

implement policies of principled alliance with various detachments of the international revolutionary movement, with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries standing in the vanguard.

The Fifth National Front Congress, held in March 1972, mapped out the main directions of party-political, economic, and cultural development on the basis of the program of the national-democratic revolution. The congress ratified the Charter of the National Front, which was drawn up on the basis of the experience and traditions of the working class parties of other countries.

Under the influence of these factors, the NF developed an alliance with other patriotic and democratic organizations; their joint efforts began to have a broad and profound impact on the mass organizations and legislative and executive organs of administration, thereby laying the foundations for the creation of a party of the working class. This principled alliance grew gradually stronger, accumulating more and more experience of the organizational activities of the organizations that made it up, based on a unified class and ideological platform and guided by the theory of scientific socialism. In this way the prerequisites were shaped for the signing on 5 February 1975 of an agreement concerning unity and the holding in October of that same year of a unification congress of the three leading detachments of patriotic forces--the National Front, the People's Democratic Alliance, and the People's Vanguard Party. The unification congress took the decision to create the United Political Organization of the National Front (OPONF), which in turn set the stage for the formation in October 1978 of the Yemeni Socialist Party--the continuer of the fighting traditions of the Yemeni patriotic movement.

As a result of the implementation of progressive transformations in democratic Yemen, major successes were accomplished in the political, economic, and cultural spheres. These transformations, affecting the most diverse aspects of life of the working people, strengthened ties between the revolutionary vanguard and the broad masses of the people, which made it possible to liquidate the various plots organized by the forces of internal and external reaction under the leadership of international imperialism. The alliance of the party and the people also made it possible to overcome difficulties both objective and subjective in nature that rose to confront the progressive transformations as a consequence of the country's severe backwardness and low level of economic development as well as the shortage of material resources and technical experience.

In the process, a number of errors of an anarchical nature were committed, and there were manifestations of "leftish" opportunism and factionality stemming from relapses of petit bourgeois ideology, survivals of tribalism, and nepotism. These negative phenomena could not, however, last for very long. They were overcome thanks to the deepening progressive, class-based purposefulness of the revolutionary process taking place in the country, the accumulation of fighting traditions and experience, and the spread and growing strength of the influence of the ideas of scientific socialism and proletarian internationalism. The left-wing opportunistic current was

liquidated on 26 June 1978. This put an end to intrigues designed to accomplish a coup, thwart party and constitutional norms, and block the creation of a party of the working class--the present-day Yemeni Socialist Party.

Experience of Economic Development of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen Under Conditions of Independence

Our party's and people's accomplishments in the various spheres of the country's life, which became possible as a result of activities based on the principle of democratic centralism, opened up broad prospects for economic and cultural advancement and a stronger national defense capability, which also had an impact on the systematic and comprehensive rise in the working people's well-being.

During the years of implementation of the 3-year plan and the First Five-Year Plan of development of the national economy, new forms of economic structure and activity came into being such as a state sector and a cooperative and mixed economy, which have become decisive in the country's economic system. They played a significant role in ensuring the balanced development of the various sectors of the national economy and meeting the material and spiritual needs of the masses of the people. At the same time, more and more of the people were drawn to participate in these new forms of economic activity, to monitor and administer them in order to ensure that they were appropriate to the basic directions of social-economic development and the tasks of improving the people's living conditions.

Major successes were accomplished in the creation of an elementary, professional, and higher-educational system throughout the republic. Conditions were created to ensure that children and young people could exercise the rights guaranteed to them by the constitution and acquire knowledge; this is the complete opposite of the situation that prevailed during the era of colonialism and the domination of the sultans. Thanks to the unselfish aid of the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union, we were able to train thousands of qualified specialists in the various professions to take part in the implementation of the plans and projects of the development of the national economy and spearhead the work of plants, factories, agricultural cooperatives, and other production collectives.

The 2nd (Adjusted) Five-Year Plan of Economic Development of the PDRY, the basic directions of which were mapped out at the 1980 Extraordinary Congress of the Yemeni Socialist Party, was oriented toward comprehensive improvement of the productive forces of the country, the development of industry, agriculture, fishing, power engineering, communications, water supplies, and housing construction. The plan calls for improvement of the work of the health care system, educational and cultural services to the people, and improvement of the country's defense capability to ensure its security. For all of these purposes capital investments are allocated in the amount of 602 million dinars (more than \$1.8 billion), whereas during the 1st Five-Year Plan the amount of investments came to only 196 million dinars (about 588 million dollars).

The results of implementation of plans for the assimilation of capital investment in the first and second (current) years of the five-year plan attest to marked improvement in efforts to put new facilities into production. These accomplishments will also serve to strengthen the country's economy and enhance the people's standard of living.

It should also be pointed out that the country's systematic development is being carried out in accordance with the class-based ideological and political course of the Yemeni Socialist Party, which is guided in its efforts by the theory of scientific socialism. It is this which constitutes a guarantee that steady progress in economics and culture will ensure the flourishing of our people, who have got rid of all manifestations of class exploitation and oppression or dependence on imperialism and colonialism.

This course is being further developed thanks to the increasingly strong ideological-political and organizational unity of the party, its enhanced role of leadership in society, the rallying of the masses of the people around it, and the people's involvement in the creative implementation of the party's policies. It is this participation which guarantees the further development of democracy for the working people and the exercise of genuine people's rule, opening up more and more possibilities for the country's future social-economic progress.

The effectiveness of the implementation of this course of action also depends on the organic links between the domestic and foreign policies of the party and the state. It is for this reason that democratic Yemen proceeds on the principles of internationalist solidarity in relations with fraternal and friendly states and with all anti-imperialist forces and is conducting policies of peaceful coexistence in relations with all the countries of differing social systems.

By carrying out this foreign policy, our country, making use of this position in the world community, is making its own contribution toward strengthening the foundations of peace and stability on our planet and opposing imperialist plans that are hostile to progress and aim to undermine detente and escalate the arms race that threatens world peace.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC CONSCIOUSNESS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 115-117

[Review by Doctor of Historical Sciences L. Ponomarev of books by V. D. Popov "Ekonomicheskoye Soznaniye: Sushchnost', Formirovaniye i Rol' v Sotsialisticheskoy Obshchestve" [Economic Consciousness: Essence, Formation, and Role in a Socialist Society], Mysl', Moscow, 1981, 239 pp; V. P. Fofanov "Ekonomicheskiye Otnosheniya i Ekonomicheskoye Soznaniye" [Economic Relations and Economic Consciousness], Novosibirsk, 1979; V. K. Drachev "Ekonomicheskoye Soznaniye Kak Faktor Razvitiya Obshchestvennogo Proizvodstva pri Sotsializme" [Economic Consciousness As a Factor in the Development of Social Production Under Socialism] (Methodological Analysis), Minsk, 1977; N. Ya. Klepach et. al. "Ekonomicheskoye Vospitaniye Mass: Organizatsiya i Effektivnost'" [Economic Education of the Masses: Organization and Effectiveness], Moscow, 1979 (pp 84-105); V. A. Medvedev "Razvitoye Sotsializm: Voprosy Formirovaniya Obshchestvennogo Soznaniya" [Developed Socialism: Problems of the Formation of Social Consciousness], Moscow, 1980 (pp 130-167)]

[Text] As we know, readers show a lively interest in controversial problems, especially when these lie in the plane where the interests of specialists in various fields of scientific knowledge intersect. To such works we may assign V. D. Popov's research devoted to an analysis of the nature of economic consciousness, problems of its formation, and its role in a socialist society.

The book is written in an original and lively manner, without any attempt to smooth off rough edges or avoid burning and sometimes controversial issues. One gets the feeling that the author is "at home" in the problem. His arguments with authors having other conceptions and his defense of his own position are accomplished on a solid scientific-methodological basis.

The appearance of this monograph stems logically from the development of scientific thinking dictated by life itself. As early as the 1950s and 1960s a number of economists, sociologists, and philosophers (A. I. Pashkov, A. I. Iliadi, A. V. Drozdov, A. K. Uledov, and others) advance the idea of the logical delineation of economic consciousness in the structure of social consciousness. In the late 1970s there appeared the first monographs by Soviet scientists analyzing economic consciousness in bourgeois and socialist societies. Also appearing at the same time were monographs on economic education and problems of ideological work which also focused on socialist

economic consciousness. Nevertheless, some scientists--often without any adequate scientific basis--doubted the existence of an economic consciousness as a particular form of social consciousness. For this reason, the problem required further serious methodological substantiation. It seems that to a certain extent this task is resolved in the book under review here. Let us focus primarily on matters elucidating the theoretical concept and logic of scientific analysis in this work.

In the introduction the author cites the main arguments (in the published literature or in oral discussions) against singling out economic consciousness as a particular form (variety) of social consciousness. The arguments, let us note, are rather solid. Subsequently, practically throughout the work, V. D. Popov polemizes step by step, argues, and in our view adduces detailed and elaborated arguments in favor of his position.

Some scientists, the author notes, believe that since the term "economic form of social consciousness" is not used in the works of K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. I. Lenin, the question as to the validity of singling out economic consciousness does not even arise. The author argues that although the classics of Marxism-Leninism did not, indeed, introduce such a term, they did elaborate a methodology of economic consciousness, laid its scientific foundations, and elucidated a number of its most important features (see pp 7, 11, 147-149, 151, 166-167, and elsewhere). Let us emphasize that Marx had the following to say about the categories of political economy under capitalism: they are "socially significant, consistently objective intellectual forms for production relations of a given historically defined social method of production ..." (K. Marx and F. Engels "Soch." [Works], vol 23, p 86).

What are we to take economic consciousness to mean? Basing himself on the classics of Marxism-Leninism and contemporary science's definitions of social consciousness and its individual forms (political, moral, legal, and so on), the author singles out several of its essential features. Economic consciousness is seen, first of all, as an aggregate of economic ideas, knowledge, views, judgments, feelings, moods, and other intellectual aspects. Secondly, social economic consciousness does not incorporate any and all economic views of particular people but only those which are socially significant for a people, a class, or other social entity. Here a line is drawn between individual and social consciousness. Thirdly, economic consciousness results from understanding, from the subject's direct reflection of economic relations (that is, "production relations of a given historically defined social method of production") and the expression of its relationship to various phenomena of the economic life of society at a particular historic moment in time.

K. Marx discovered not only the laws governing the development of society as a whole but also those governing the development of the economy, making it possible to explain on a scientific basis the nature of the formation of economic consciousness and its structure.

What does the author of this monograph mean by economic thought? How does it relate to social economic consciousness? The work devotes special attention

to these matters. Primarily this involves the philosophical and sociological meaning of the category "thought." Economic thought is investigated in the context of processes of social understanding and the formation of social consciousness.

Economic thought, the author notes, is on the one hand a process of reflection, people's conscious perception of their economic relations in the form of ideas, concepts, theories, and so on. On the other hand, economic thought is a process by which people interpret and assimilate their accumulated social economic knowledge and process day-to-day economic information acquired through channels of the mass media (pp 145-146).

The author presents a rather complete and well-argued elucidation of the forms and levels of economic thought.

Now with regard to the logic of the scientific analysis. In Chapter 1 the problem is examined in its historical-philosophical aspects. V. D. Popov analyzes the development of the views of Soviet scientists concerning the structure of social consciousness. Generalizing the findings of a number of authors, he elucidates the basic criteria of economic consciousness. He examines the particular and specific gnoseological and sociological criteria. He comes to the conclusion that social practice and the social need for ideas, concepts, and views corresponding to this practice constitute grounds for singling out relatively independent components in the content of social consciousness (p 59).

Hence, economic consciousness emerges as a product of people's unmediated and mediated perception of economic relations, as an inseparable intellectual element of their conscious, goal-oriented economic activities. Then the author examines the problem in its philosophical-economic aspect. The main task in this part of the work is to reveal the "inner" mechanism of the formation of socially significant economic ideas and views and seek out the main determinants of such a mechanism, the cause-and-effect links between economic activities and economic consciousness.

The main methodological principle chosen for the study of this complex and imperfectly understood question is economic determinism, which constitutes the nucleus of social determinism. Economic determinism as a principle is scientifically elaborated and extensively utilized in Marx.

The author analyzes the interconnection of the objective and the subjective, the material and the ideal in order to demonstrate the place and role of economic consciousness in the development of economic activities, in the systematic perfection of economic relations.

Proceeding on the basis of general philosophical concepts of the unity of activities, relations, and consciousness, the author investigates their interconnection as the "living tissue" of mechanisms of action and the deliberate utilization of economic laws under socialism. In doing so, V. D. Popov draws on the works of such well-known Soviet economists as L. I. Abalkin, D. V. Valovoy, V. N. Kashin, I. I. Kuz'minov, A. I. Pashkov,

A. A. Sergeyev, V. N. Cherkovets, V. P. Shkredov, and others who dealt with these problems in one way or another.

The author shows that with the rise and stage-by-stage development of new, socialist production relations there also came into being a new, socialist economic consciousness of the workers, peasants, and the people as a whole. At the same time, as V. D. Popov notes, it is wrong to think that the necessary effect has been achieved in this matter. Instances of mismanagement and wastefulness with regard to raw materials, supplies, equipment, and so on indicate that both economic and moral consciousness is as yet imperfect and must be shaped in a more deliberate manner. The author notes correctly that "there is a discrepancy between social economic consciousness as an aggregate of progressive ideas, views, and moods reflecting the general line of development of economic relations by most of the Soviet people, and the economic consciousness of some particular citizens" (p 123). Private-ownership views "infect the consciousness of considerable numbers of people," and we could hardly agree more.

On the gnoseological plane the author explores primarily the object of reflection--the structure of economic relations--and consequently the content aspect of economic consciousness.

Some scientists hold the view that economic consciousness cannot be singled out as an independent variety of social consciousness--because economic relations, as a variant of material relations, are shaped without passing through people's consciousness, in contrast to political, legal, moral, and other ideological relations. Thus, economic relations are reflected only via political, legal, and other familiar varieties of consciousness and in no way directly via economic consciousness. But why? Doesn't social consciousness (including economic consciousness) exert a reciprocal effect on economics?

"The fact that economic relations are shaped without passing through people's consciousness does not mean that their development, functioning, and improvement are accomplished--especially in a socialist society--independently of consciousness" (p 131).

V. D. Popov answers these questions in elaborated form while examining the gnoseological mechanism of the reflection of economic relations via social consciousness as a whole and, in particular, economic consciousness, and the interaction between economic consciousness and other varieties of social consciousness.

The author of the monograph goes on to reveal the content of economic consciousness. Along with the various levels (mundane and theoretical) he shows how and by what components of content economic consciousness is incorporated in science, ideology, and social psychology.

The reader who has carefully read V. D. Popov's work will undoubtedly come to the conclusion that effective, practical development of the economic education of the working people and the realization of Lenin's ideas about the economic education of the masses can be deemed to be an answer to the

objective need of socialism to ensure that every worker is truly the master of his country, that the socialist economy becomes the most economical in the world. In this connection, the concluding section of the monograph is of indisputable theoretical and practical value: there the author endeavors to demonstrate the role of economic consciousness in improving the economic life of socialist society. Unfortunately, V. D. Popov has narrowed the thrust of his investigation too much here. He confines himself to mere elucidation of the basic functions of economic consciousness, the role of public opinion, and factors of transforming economic knowledge into people's beliefs and behavior. These are unquestionably vital directions in the practical manifestation of economic consciousness, and they ought to be elucidated in a more integrated manner. It is correct that "the more perfected economic social consciousness becomes the more prerequisites there are for perfecting economic, social-political, and intellectual life" (p 238). Herein lies one of the possibilities for effective struggle against mismanagement and wastefulness, struggle for economy and thriftiness in the national economy, struggle to overcome in people's consciousness outmoded stereotypes of management, to achieve genuine unity in personal and social interests, to break down the old "barriers" between "mine" and "ours."

The time has come, one would think, to get off debates as to whether or not to recognize this variety of consciousness and urge philosophers, economists, sociologists, and pedagogues to vigorously work out the theory and practice of the formation and functioning of socialist consciousness. Life itself advances this priority problem to the forefront.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

THE VICTORIOUS ADVANCE OF SOCIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 117-120

[Review by Doctor of Economic Sciences A. Uspenskiy and Doctor of Economic Sciences P. Khromov, corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences Ukrainian SSR, of "Istoriya Sotsialisticheskoy Ekonomiki SSSR" [History of the Socialist Economy of the USSR]. In seven volumes. Nauka, Moscow, 1976-1980. Editorial board: USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member V. A. Vinogradov; Doctor of Economic Sciences Yu. F. Vorob'yev; Doctor of Economic Sciences I. A. Gladkov (editor in chief); USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member Ye. I. Kapustin; Academician N. N. Nekrasov; USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member A. I. Pashkov; Academician N. P. Fedorenko; Doctor of Economic Sciences V. N. Cherkovets. Vol 1: "Sovetskaya Ekonomika v 1917-1920 gg." [The Soviet Economy in 1917-1920]; vol 2: "Perekhod k Nepu. Vosstanovleniye Narodnogo Khozyaystva SSSR. 1921-1925 gg." [Transition to the NEP. Restoration of the USSR National Economy. 1921-1925]; vol 3: "Sozdaniye Fundamenta Sotsialisticheskoy Ekonomiki v SSSR. 1926-1932 gg." [Laying of the Foundations of the Socialist Economy in the USSR. 1926-1932]; vol 4: "Zaversheniye Sotsialisticheskogo Preobrazovaniya Ekonomiki. Pobeda Sotsializma v SSSR. 1933-1937 gg." [Completion of the Socialist Transformation of the Economy. The Victory of Socialism in the USSR. 1933-1937]; vol 5: "Sovetskaya Ekonomika Nakanune i v Period Velikoy Otechestvennoy Voyny. 1938-1945 gg." [The Soviet Economy on the Eve and During the Great Patriotic War. 1938-1945]; vol 6: "Vosstanovleniye Narodnogo Khozyaystva SSSR. Sozdaniye Ekonomiki Razvitogo Sotsializma. 1946-Nachalo 1960-kh Godov" [Restoration of the USSR National Economy. Creation of the Economy of Developed Socialism. 1946-Beginning of the 1960s]; vol 7: "Ekonomika SSSR na Etape Razvitogo Sotsializma. 1960-1970-ye Gody" [The USSR Economy in the Stage of Developed Socialism. 1960-1970s]].

[Text] The necessity of generalizing the worldwide historical experience of the revolutionary-transforming activities of the CPSU is one of the most important tasks assigned to the social sciences by the decisions of the 26th party congress. In this regard, the multifaceted work "History of the Socialist Economy of the USSR" occupies a prominent place among works published in recent years. The seven volumes of the work under review, prepared by the Institute of Economics of the USSR Academy of Sciences (with the participation of a number of authors from other scientific institutions of Moscow) and published by Nauka, covers the time from the first revolutionary social-economic transformations accomplished immediately after the victory of October to the end of the 1970s.

The seven volumes graphically portray the victorious advance of socialism in our country in a relatively brief historical period--a path which by the older, "customary" standards would require centuries. The authors base themselves on the theoretical and methodological postulates of the Marxist-Leninist classics, decisions of party congresses, conferences, and CPSU Central Committee plenums, the most important documents of the Central Committee and the Soviet government with regard to matters of economic construction, and the works and speeches of CPSU Central Committee General Secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and other party and state officials. The work makes extensive use of the Leninist theoretical legacy. The authors use V. I. Lenin's formulated theory of socialist revolution and plan for the building of socialism encompassing all spheres of social life as the basis for an analysis of the course of socialist construction in our country. The seven volumes elucidate Lenin's role as the greatest theoretician and organizer of the new, planned system of economy, who supervised the practical laying of the foundations of a socialist economy in the multinational Soviet state.

A major virtue of the work under review is its comprehensive elucidation of the communist party's guiding role in the building of socialism and communism in the USSR. Characterizing the stages socialist construction has gone through, and their various features, the authors reveal the continuity of the party's economic strategy, which is oriented toward the victory of socialism and then the conquest of new goals in social-economic maturity. The seven volumes explore the characteristics of the manifestation of the general laws governing socialist transformation of the national economy in the various republics, krays, and oblasts. Proceeding on the basis of the organic unity of nationwide and national tasks, in its economic policies the party called for accelerated growth of the economy and culture of national regions that were backward in the past.

A distinguishing feature of the work is its integrated approach to the economic history of the USSR, combining its problematic and its sectorial aspects. Concrete-historical analysis serves as the basis of theoretical generalizations. This fundamental study contains an elaborated characterization of the development of the Soviet economy in all its spheres and sectors. Every section is based on the generalization of a large amount of factual material, including a variety of statistical data from the holdings of a number of central archives. An analysis of vast statistical material has enabled the authors to portray in relief the unique economic processes taking place in the different historical stages of the country's development. The work is distinguished by the abundance of its historical sources, comprising research into various sectors of the USSR's economics and history published both in the past and in very recent times. All of this attests to the fundamental nature of the scientific apparatus of the work under review.

The structure of each volume as a whole is characterized by internal unity and logical balance. The work covers all the most important sectors of industry (fuel, electrical power, machine building, metallurgy, chemistry, and the light and food industries), agriculture, transport, and capital construction. In special chapters, moreover, the authors analyze rates and

proportions in the development of social production, the organization of labor and wages, cadre training, and the development of socialist competition. Particular sections deal with an analysis of the financial system of the Soviet state, the development of trade, foreign economic ties, culture, science, education, and consumer services, and the rise of the material and cultural standard of living of the Soviet people. The authors focus much attention on an analysis of the development of the economies of the union republics and their role in the country's unified national economy complex.

The overall theoretical thrust of the study is manifested in sections which elucidate the development of the system of planning of the national economy, the role and significance of commodity and monetary relations in the USSR's economy, the improvement of the economic mechanism and forms of administration of industry, the dynamics of the social-economic structure of the socialist society, and the principles of deployment of productive forces. Each volume of the work under review includes chapters which foretell problematic and sectorial aspects and contain characterizations of the basic features and traits of development of the Soviet economy in a particular time span. All of this has enabled the authors to present a full picture of its rise and development.

On the basis of Marxist-Leninist teachings concerning social-economic formations and the concepts of developed socialism formulated by the CPSU in recent years, the authors show that the USSR's national economy has passed through periods and stages in its historical development that have their own characteristic traits and features. This is reflected in the structure of the work.

The first four volumes deal with the implementation of Lenin's plan for the building of socialism, the creative development of this plan by the communist party, and the heroic labor of the Soviet people, who accomplished socialist industrialization and collectivization of agriculture, and a cultural revolution, and overcame the consequences of the former social-economic inequality among peoples. As a result of these profound revolutionary transformations in the USSR, in the second half of the 1930s the foundations of the material-technical basis of socialism had been laid--industry and agriculture were mechanized on a large scale, the economy was no longer mixed, the exploiting classes had been liquidated, and socialist production relations prevailed in the cities and the countryside--relations of collectivism, comradely collaboration, and mutual aid. The scientific validity of Lenin's conclusion that socialism could be built in one separate country had been demonstrated in practice.

Volume 5 presents a comprehensive analysis of the work of the national economy under very difficult wartime conditions, during which the communist party and the Soviet state, making use of the advantages of the planned system of economy, accomplished the objective prerequisites for victory over fascism embodied in the socialist system. The work clearly shows how the party and the government, mobilizing all the people's forces to crush the enemy, successfully restructured the economy onto a wartime footing, organized a smoothly operating military economy, and ensured a fast pace of

armaments production. The advantages of the planned socialist economy enabled the Soviet Union to simultaneously conduct large-scale military assault operations and accomplish an enormous amount of work on new capital construction and economic restoration in regions liberated from enemy occupation, something that no capitalist state was capable of.

Volume 6 of the work devotes much space to the postwar period of restoration of the national economy. The 1946-1950 five-year plan was one of the most important stages in the development of the Soviet economy. The enemies of socialism counted on our country's requiring many decades to make up for the colossal material losses caused by the war. In just a few years, without outside financial or economic help, the Soviet people under the leadership of the communist party restored the national economy on a new technical basis and achieved a further economic and cultural upsurge. At the same time, the Soviet people--and this is convincingly demonstrated in the work--provided large-scale, unselfish aid to the fraternal peoples of Europe and Asia who had embarked on the path of socialism.

The creation of the economy of a developed socialist society is elucidated in Part II of Volume 6. The process was characterized by quantitative growth and qualitative improvement of the material-technical base of socialism, as is repeatedly confirmed by factual material attesting to the accelerated adoption of the latest achievements of the modern scientific-technical revolution, the declining share of manual, low-skilled, and heavy physical labor, and the increasing level of mechanization and automation of production processes. During that period, concentration and specialization of production became stronger, and a number of large-scale projects were accomplished (the construction of huge GESs, and the development of tens of millions of hectares of virgin lands and wasteland).

Elucidating the stage of construction of developed socialism, the authors reveal the profound qualitative changes that took place in the structure of the national economy. The work also analyzes qualitative changes taking place in the class structure of society, in the level of well-being of the Soviet people, and in cultural, educational, and scientific development. Radical changes took place in the correlation of forces between socialism and capitalism in the world arena. These changes eliminated the possibility of restoring the capitalist system by the forces of world imperialism. Socialism in the USSR won complete and final victory.

Even though questions of the economy of developed socialism are being intensively studied by Soviet economists, and a number of works devoted to their analysis have been published, this array of problems has not been adequately studied. And the final volume--Volume 7--is in essence the first work to examine the Soviet economy at the stage of developed socialism in such a thorough and detailed manner.

The materials of the volume testify to the enormous successes in boosting social production, resolving large and vital social tasks, and enhancing the country's economic and defense potentials that were accomplished by the Soviet people under the leadership of the communist party in the 1960s and

1970s. The maturity of the economic system of developed socialism enabled the CPSU and the Soviet government to consistently orient the progress of social production toward increasingly full satisfaction of the working people's material and spiritual needs. An analysis of the processes of concentration, specialization, and cooperation taking place in the developed socialist economy has enabled the authors to demonstrate convincingly that real socialization of labor and production has risen to a new level.

The authors examine the dynamics of social production as inseparably linked to the resolution of tasks of social development and changes in the social-class structure of Soviet society, focusing on the strengthening of its social homogeneity, the attainment of full equality among peoples, and the high educational level of all strata of the population.

Much space in this volume is devoted to the USSR's role in the development of the world socialist economic system. The authors present an extensive characterization of the new type of interstate relations that came into being with the formation of the world socialist system. These are relations of equality, fraternal collaboration, and mutual aid, as reflected in the coordination of national economic plans, the elaboration of international specialization and cooperation of production, and socialist economic integration being implemented in the interests of the rapid economic and cultural growth of each country and the strengthening of the power of the whole world socialist system. At the stage of mature socialism achieved by the Soviet Union, the role of its internationalist ties in social-economic progress has been enhanced.

Under present conditions, when world development is determined by the course and results of the historic competition between socialism and capitalism, the bourgeois ideologues are doing their utmost to belittle the advantages and accomplishments of the socialist economy and falsify the experience of its development. The materials of this seven-volume work systematically refute the bourgeois and revisionist falsifications of the experience of socialist and communist construction in the USSR, which imparts keen political significance to the work. In a well-argued and knowledgeable fashion the authors wage a decisive battle against all manner of attempts to belittle the significance of the Soviet people's socialist gains.

This collective work elucidates in clear detail the worldwide historic significance of the experience of socialist and communist construction in the USSR, which constitutes a model of just organization of society in the interests of the working people. This experience is being extensively utilized by the fraternal countries of the socialist comity as well as by countries that have been liberated from colonial oppression and embarked on the path of progressive social-economic transformations. The seven volumes of this work elucidate the magnificence of the historic deeds accomplished by the working people of our country under the leadership of the party of Lenin. The peoples of the land of the soviets are justly proud of their past, for it constitutes the colossal accumulated experience of the creation of a new society unprecedented in history. This experience is of permanent significance to the destiny of all mankind.

The appearance of this unparalleled seven-volume work constitutes a major contribution to the study of the economic history of the USSR and is of great scientific, political, and ideological importance. It has deservedly attracted widespread attention in the Soviet and international scientific community.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

FROM THE HISTORY OF NATIONAL INTELLECTUAL CULTURE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 120-124

[Review by V. Shinkaruk, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and Academician of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences, of "Istoriya Gorodov i Sel Ukrainskoy SSR" [History of the Cities and Villages of the Ukrainian SSR]. In 26 volumes. "Kiev.", Institut Istorii Akademii Nauk USSR. Glavnaya Redaktsiya Ukrainskoy Sovetskoy Entsiklopedii, 1979, 596 pp; P. P. Tolochko, "Kiyev i Kiyevskaya Zemlya v Epokhu Feodal'noy Razdroblennosti XII-XIII Vekov" [Kiev and the Kievan Land in the Era of Feudal Fragmentation of the 12th-13th Centuries], Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1980, 224 pp; A. F. Zamalejev and V. A. Zots, "Mysliteli Kiyevskoy Rusi" [Intellectuals of Kievan Rus], Vyshcha Shkola, Kiev, 1981, 160 pp; Z. I. Khyzhnyak, "Kievo-Mohylyans'ka Akademiya" [The Kiev-Mogilyan Academy], second revised and enlarged edition, Vyshcha Shkola, Kiev, 1981, 236 pp; "Ideynnye Svyazi Progressivnykh Mysliteley Bratskikh Narodov (XVII-XVIII vv)" [Ideological Relations Among Progressive Intellectuals of the Fraternal Nations (17th-18th Centuries)], Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1978, 192 pp; V. M. Nichik, "Feofan Prokopovich, "Mysl", Moscow, 1977, 192 pp; V. M. Nichik, "Iz Istorii Otechestvennoy Filosofii Kontsa XVII-Nachala XVIII v." [From the History of National Philosophy at the End of the 17th Century and the Beginning of the 18th Century], Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1978, 300 pp; Ya. M. Stratiy, "Problemy Naturfilosofii v Filosofskoy Mysli Ukrainy XVII v." [Problems of Natural Philosophy in the Philosophical Thought of the Ukraine in the 17th Century], Naukova Dumka, Kiev, 1981, 208 pp; I. V. Ivan'yo, "Ocherk Razvitiya Esteticheskoy Mysli Ukrainy" [Study of the Development of Aesthetic Thought in the Ukraine], Iskusstvo, Moscow, 1981, 424 pp]

[Text] The 1500th anniversary of Kiev impels Soviet social scientists to turn again and again to the working out of important problems of the rise and development of the internationalist unity of the Russian, Ukrainian, and Belorussian peoples, their material and intellectual culture. Among recent studies dealing with the founding of one of our motherland's oldest cities--Kiev--a prominent place is occupied by works published by the country's leading publishing houses.

The well-known multivolume series "History of the Cities and Villages of the Ukrainian SSR" has issued a special volume on Kiev. This fundamental collective work was prepared under the scientific-methodological supervision of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Institute of History and has been awarded

the USSR State Prize. It recounts the historical development of the city from its founding to our own days.

Since it was the center of the Polyane Principality, and thanks to its advantageous geographical location, Kiev was a place of intertribal contacts in early times. At the turn of the 8th and 9th centuries there was formed around the Polyane Principality in the middle Dnepr region a large state entity known as "the Russian land," on the basis of which the early feudal Kievan Rus state came into being. Kiev was its center and played a leading role in the history of this powerful Eastern Slav state, becoming the cradle of three fraternal nations--Russian, Ukrainian, and Belorussian, and providing the vital impetus for their economic, political, and cultural unity.

Kiev played an especially vital role in the Ukrainian people's struggle to unite with the Great Russian people in a unified Russian state and to consolidate their friendship. After the Ukraine was joined to Russia the city was transformed into one of the most important economic and cultural centers of our country.

During the period of development of capitalism Kiev became a major industrial center, one of the sources of the revolutionary-democratic and later the proletarian movement. The "Alliance for the Struggle for the Liberation of the Working Class," founded in Kiev in 1897 soon after the one organized in St. Petersburg by V. I. Lenin in 1895, and RABOCHAYA GAZETA, the illegal organ of the Social Democrats, made their contribution toward implementing Lenin's ideas concerning the creation of a revolutionary Marxist party.

The city's working people made brilliant, glorious contributions to the annals of the Ukrainian people's heroic struggle for the victory of Great October and the consolidation of the power of the Soviets in the Ukraine. In selfless battle against the forces of the counterrevolutionary bourgeois-nationalistic Central Rada, the White Guards, and foreign interventionists, they were provided vital aid by the working people of Russia.

In difficult conditions of ruin and famine, relying on the fraternal aid of the Russian and other peoples of our country, the working people of the Ukraine restored the national economy and then successfully resolved the tasks of socialist construction. During the period of the prewar five-year plans, Kiev's Arsenal, Leninskaya Kuznitsa, and Bol'shevik plants became major enterprises. The republic's science and culture developed at an unprecedented pace.

Under the leadership of the party organization, the people of Kiev manifested genuine heroism in the struggle against fascism during the Great Patriotic War. In the very first days of the war the city sent to the front about 200,000 men, including over 16,000 communists. A brilliant page in the history of the Great Patriotic War was the heroic defense of Kiev from July through September 1941. Kiev's inhabitants fought bravely together with troops of the Southwestern Front to defend their native city against Hitler's invaders.

This volume focuses much attention on the many centuries of friendship between the Russian, Ukrainian, and other peoples of our country, as manifested in the struggle to build a developed socialist society. The book emphasizes that close collaboration among the peoples of our multinational country and further uniting of their efforts constitute the guarantee of the success of the Soviet Ukraine.

Also of substantial interest is the new monograph by P. P. Tolochko, which investigates the period of Kievan Rus in the 12th and 13th centuries, including the Mongol-Tatar invasion. This difficult period has always attracted the attention of researchers, given rise to many disputes, and been the focus of ideological struggle. Thus, the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists make extensive use of the views of Grushevskiy, as presented in his "Ocherk Istorii Kiyevskoy Zemli" [Study of the History of the Kievan Land]. In the face of historical facts this bourgeois-nationalist historian claimed that there was no unified old Russian state after the 11th century. From this he concluded that Kievan Rus lacked ethnic unity and that a Ukrainian nation existed as early as the 10th through 13th centuries. Antihistorical conclusions like this constitute the theoretical basis of the ideological speculations of the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists concerning the "separate" development of a Ukrainian nation, one not linked to the fraternal Russian and Belorussian peoples. Clerical falsifiers of the history of Ancient Rus during this period claim that the culture of Kiev and the Kievan land was not primarily secular but Christian, a claim which also fails to correspond to the facts.

Drawing from the works of B. D. Grekov, M. N. Tikhomirov, B. A. Rybakov, A. N. Nasov, L. V. Cherepnin, V. T. Pashuto, V. I. Dovzhenko, and other Soviet historians who worked out the scientific concept of the history of the ancient Russian state, and also the findings of numerous archaeological excavations, the author traces the social-economic and political life of Kievan Rus during the period of feudal fragmentation. In doing so, he focuses much attention on an elucidation of the political history of Rus in the 12th and 13th centuries as well as problems of the ancient Russian nationalities constituting the common ethnic basis of the Russian, Ukrainian, and Belorussian peoples. He also portrays the enormous damage done to Rus by the Mongol-Tatar invasion. Considerable space is devoted to a critique of anti-Marxist views on the history and culture of Ancient Rus.

In the 11th century Kiev was a center of literary learning, where the leading thinkers of Rus were concentrated. Nestor, the author of that outstanding chronicle "Povesti Vremennykh Let" [Accounts of Temporal Years] and one of Old Russia's most distinguished chroniclers worked in Kiev's Pechersk Monastery. The great Prince Vladimir Monomakh, author of the famous treatise "Poucheniye" [Sermon] and other works, was a well-known publicist of the 12th century. Later, around 1185, that outstanding monument of Old Russian poetic creativity--"Slovo o Polku Igoreve" [Tale of the Host of Igor]--was composed in Kiev. Along with literary learning and enlightenment, scientific-philosophical knowledge became widespread in Kiev and all of Rus. To this topic is devoted A. F. Zamalev's and V. A. Zots's historical-philosophical study "Intellectuals of Kievan Rus."

The period investigated in the book is of exceptional interest and importance in the history of national philosophy, for it was at that time that the intellectual development of the three fraternal peoples--the Russian, Ukrainian, and Belorussian--took place. The authors elucidate the philosophical-theoretical views of the leading intellectuals of Kievan Rus in the 11th through 13th centuries and characterize the uniqueness of Old Russian philosophy.

In contrast to existing studies of the problems of the intellectual culture of Kievan Rus, prepared chiefly by historians who have a thorough knowledge of their sources but who have not set themselves the task of delineating philosophical-gnoseological problems, A. F. Zamalejev and V. A. Zots not only present extensive source materials but also make confident use of the special methodology of investigating the historical-philosophical problems of Kievan Rus.

Structuring the investigation on personalities has enabled the authors to cover a greater number of problems (historical, philosophical-sociological, and ethical) and to make extensive use of the "biographical" aspect in interpreting the complex and by no means uniformly valuable literary legacy of the native medieval bookmen. Of greatest interest in the monograph, however, is its conceptual aspect. On the basis of the necessity of distinguishing the actual Christianization of Rus, undertaken by Prince Vladimir Svyatoslavich in order to consolidate the power of the grand princes, and the formation of the church and monastery organization, which took place under circumstances of the fragmentation of the country into apanage principalities, the authors point out that the church was wholly oriented toward orthodox Byzantinism, with its antihellenism and rejection of "human wisdom"--philosophy. In the course of secular orientation, Christianization takes the form of adapting to the historical and cultural life of Kievan Rus, of accommodation to the spiritual values of Slavic paganism, but at the same time interest in the early Christian views of Ilarion, Ioann, and Vladimir Monomakh and the philosophical teachings of "antiquity" (Kliment Smolyatich) is recognized as valid.

According to the authors, this circumstance enabled the Old Russian thinkers to wage a vigorous and decisive battle against the ideology of the monasteries and had a fundamental influence on the rise and development of Old Russian philosophy which, although of a type similar to the medieval philosophy of the West, is distinguished from it in that it served primarily the aims of secular policies.

This work is of special topicality in the context of today's ideological struggle. As we know, in recent times the clerical-nationalistic circles of the West have been trumpeting a thesis about some "mystical correlation" between the spiritual mentality of the Russians, Ukrainians, and Belorussians and the basic postulates of the Christian religion, their "vital affinity" to the church. In the face of historical realities, the Vatican in particular claims that Kievan Rus was oriented toward the papacy from the beginning and was "Catholic" in aspiration. The monograph's authors expose the groundlessness of such notions.

The most tragic event in the life of Ancient Rus was the Mongol-Tatar invasion. But even under the conditions of this heavy yoke, Kiev's intellectual life did not disappear--it remained the ideological hearth of resistance.

In the course of struggle against the Lithuanian, Polish, and Hungarian feudal-Catholic enslavement and the devastating Tatar invasions, there was an ongoing process of the formation and consolidation of the Ukrainian nationality in the 13th through 16th centuries, and a national-liberation movement grew in strength. The mutual influence of the cultures of the Slavic peoples--especially the Russian, Ukrainian, and Belorussian peoples--grew stronger.

Literary monuments, chronicles, and business correspondence attest to the presence of a broad circle of educated people in Kiev. A significant role in the development of education was played by Kiev's Bratskaya School, which was combined in 1632 with the Lavra School and renamed the Kiev-Bratskaya College.

The college consisted of four lower grades and classes in ethics, rhetoric, and philosophy. Most of the lecture courses were given in Latin. Instruction was provided in Slavonic, Greek, Polish, and other languages, rhetoric, poetics, philosophy, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, music, and later on psychology and medicine. The best scientific and pedagogical minds were gathered around the college--scholars, writers, and state and church figures. In the second half of the 17th century it became virtually a higher educational institution with an enrollment of at least 1,000 persons. In the beginning of the 18th century the college was officially renamed an academy.

Z. I. Khyzhnyak's monograph, now published in a second and considerably revised and enlarged edition, is the first in Soviet historiography to elucidate broadly the significance of the Kiev-Mogilyan Academy both in the history of the education, science, culture, and social-political thought of the Ukrainian people, and in strengthening their ties of friendship with the fraternal Russian and Belorussian peoples.

Exploring the preconditions of the development of higher education in the Ukraine, the author examines them in close connection with the country's social-economic and cultural development as well as its ideological life, inasmuch as the Kiev Bratskaya School, the College, and the Academy played a prominent role in the Ukrainian people's struggle for social and national independence against spiritual enslavement by the reactionary forces of the Catholic gentry.

On the basis of abundant archival and published sources, the author analyzes the process of instruction in the Academy and demonstrates its high scientific level for that time. The work rightly notes that the Academy was the scientific center for the development of the Ukrainian literary language, poetry school, and philosophical thought, the development of historical science and the teaching of foreign languages. The level of instruction in the Academy matched the standards of higher schools in Europe. The Kiev-Mogilyan Academy occupied a prominent place as well in the development of inter-Slavic cultural ties in the 17th through the first half of the 18th centuries.

The author concludes that the Kiev-Mogilyan Academy, like the Moscow Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy in that period, played the role of an inter-Slavic center of enlightenment, and that it rightly deserves a great deal of credit for strengthening the traditional friendly relations between the Slavic peoples.

The work demonstrates the activities of the Academy, a major center of education, science, and culture in Eastern Europe, its influence on the development of education in Moldavia, Wallachia, Serbia, and Montenegro, and its ties with leading centers of enlightenment in other countries.

In recent years scholars investigating problems of the rise of national philosophy have been turning, in particular, to the philosophical legacy of the Kiev-Mogilyan Academy. This is understandable, because the Academy produced such eminent figures as Inokentiy Gizel', Dmitriy Rostovskiy, Feofan Prokopovich, Stefan Yavorskiy, Manuil Kozachinskiy, and Georgiy Koniskiy; Mikhail Lomonosov attended lectures there, also Grigoriy Skovorod whose spiritual legacy belongs equally to the Ukrainian, Russian, and Belorussian peoples. Through their scientific and political works and social endeavors they made a substantial contribution toward substantiation of the necessity of the state and cultural union of the Ukraine and Belorussia with fraternal Russia.

The works of Soviet scientists decisively refute the assessment of the Kiev-Mogilyan Academy's philosophical legacy given by scientists of the nobility and the bourgeoisie, who claimed that the philosophy in that educational institution was purely scholastic, divorced from life, a slavish copy of similar philosophical doctrines taught in the Jesuit colleges. On the basis of studies of philosophical courses taught in the Kiev-Mogilyan and the Moscow Slavonic-Greek-Latin academies, translated from the Latin for the first time, the authors have shown that in essence they reflected a crisis, a breakdown of the medieval church-theological world view. Along with substantial elements of scholasticism, therefore, they also purveyed ideas tending toward philosophical teachings characteristic of the eras of the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the early Enlightenment. Most of the philosophical courses, in the Kiev-Mogilyan Academy, for example, criticized Thomism, which served as the ideological weapon of Catholic expansionism in Ukrainian and Belorussian lands. Far from being divorced from life, these courses actually responded to the demands of the Ukrainian people's national-liberation struggle. Criticism of the social practice of Catholicism and certain of its dogmas was combined with a critique of its philosophical-theological foundations. At the same time, the professors of the Kiev-Mogilyan Academy, utilizing the experience of other creeds, attempted to give a rational interpretation of Orthodox doctrines, which inevitably led to a breakdown of orthodoxy and to the birth of heresies and free-thinking.

The authors of these works have elucidated in detail the process of changes in the subject of philosophy at that time and demonstrated its reorientation away from theology toward the understanding of nature, man, and society. Substantial changes were also taking place in the structure of philosophical knowledge and the hierarchical ranking of its subunits. Scholastic logic and metaphysics gradually lost their leading significance. The development of

humanistic studies brought rhetoric to the forefront, which took over the function of philosophical methodology; there was considerable expansion also in the teaching of natural philosophy, reflecting the development of the natural sciences.

Gradually breaking down the entrenched system of the medieval theological world view, our national natural philosophy made a major contribution to the creation of scientific traditions which were developed further in the 18th century.

I. V. Ivan'yo's book deals with an examination of the aesthetic self-awareness of the Eastern Slavs in Kievan Rus, and the rise and development of aesthetic thought in the Ukraine.

The author has made use of extensive material from the history of Ukrainian artistic culture and its associated theoretical concepts to elucidate the progressive development of aesthetic thought. As a philosophy of artistic culture, aesthetics is examined in close connection with the history of the Ukraine's philosophical thought, arts, and art criticism. The book traces the rise and development of aesthetic considerations, ideas, concepts, and teachings covering almost 1,000 years in the development of aesthetic thought in the Ukraine, from its origins to our days. Drawing on the experience of Soviet scientists, in particular M. F. Ovsyannikov, A. F. Losev, D. S. Likhachev, and many others, the author shows how progressive aesthetic thought came into being and developed in the struggle between materialism and idealism in the Ukraine, and what constituted its main historical and theoretical content.

The book elucidates the main ideas that arose during the period of the flourishing of Kievan Rus and subsequent periods. An innovative feature is the section which examines the contribution made by the Kiev-Mogilyan academics to the development of the science of aesthetics. A central place is assigned to aesthetic problems relating to the formation of a new Ukrainian culture on a popular basis. In this connection, the work presents a generalized characterization of the contributions made to the history of aesthetics by T. Shevchenko, I. Franko, P. Grabovskiy, M. Kotsubinskiy, Lesya Ukrainka, A. Potebnya, and others. The book shows convincingly that their historical community accounts for the unity of the social thinking and culture of the Russian and Ukrainian peoples, including their views on aesthetics.

Kiev's 1,500-year jubilee, celebrated in May, once more drew scientists' attention to the history of our motherland, enabling them to reveal the most important laws governing the development of our national intellectual culture as a whole and trace the economic, political, and other contacts of our fraternal peoples that have been expanding constantly over the centuries.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

SHORT BOOK REVIEWS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 15, Oct 82 pp 124-128

[Text] Review by Doctor of Historical Sciences V. Novikov of "Aktual'nyye Problemy Sovetskoy Istoriografii Pervoy Russkoy Revolyutsii" [Current Problems of Soviet Historiography of the First Russian Revolution], Nauka, Moscow, 1978, 317 pp.

Problems of the history and the world historic significance of the experience of Russia's three revolutions have continued to occupy a prominent place in the researches of Soviet scientists. The scientific analysis of these problems retains its topicality in our time as well. V. I. Lenin repeatedly emphasized the necessity of thoroughly studying the experience of the first Russian revolution and broadly propagandizing its lessons and traditions. "We need to see to it," he wrote, "--and no one else will see to it--that the people are aware of these full lives and these days which are so rich in content and so magnificent in terms of their significance and consequences...." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 16, p 26).

Lenin was at the wellsprings of Soviet historiography of the three Russian revolutions. It was he who worked out a genuinely scientific concept of their history. Historiographical studies of this plane have been carried out by Soviet scientists over a number of decades, but they reached their greatest scope in the 1950s and 1960s.

The collection under review here presents an analysis of the literature dealing with the most important problems of the 1905-1907 revolution. It is a book about books, about scientists, about what has been done and still needs to be done.

Soviet historical science has gone a long way in studying Russia's first revolution. Further research, however, requires comprehensive historiographical analysis and study of sources, the concentrated efforts of scientists needed to work out those questions which have been inadequately studied up to now. It is the resolution of this task to which this collection addresses itself in part.

The book presents the basic findings and maps out the tasks involved in studying the history of the first Russian revolution. The work divides the

development of its Soviet historiography into three stages and characterizes the thematics of the scientific research, the range of authors, and the strong and weak aspects of works that have been published. It notes that local historians in collaboration with Moscow and Leningrad scientists have made a major contribution to the study of the revolutionary events of 1905-1907 in various regions of the country.

The book examines the theme of Soviet historiography in the 1920s and the early 1930s. It analyzes the works of Soviet historians of those years, including such eminent students of and active participants in the revolutionary movement as M. N. Pokrovskiy and Ye. M. Yaroslavskiy and their role in affirming Lenin's conception of the first Russian revolution in historical science and in dethroning Menshevist-Trotskyist views.

The historical literature of the 1920s and the early 1930s also affirms Lenin's conception of the history of the professional workers movement in the 1905-1907 revolution. The formation of the trade unions as fighting class organizations of the proletariat, Lenin's and the bolshevik party's attitude to them, and the nature of the disagreement between the bolsheviks and the mensheviks regarding the trade union issue and a number of other matters are analyzed in detail. This theme is of considerable interest even today for a correct understanding of the place and role of the most massive organization in the country.

From 1918 to the mid-1930s, about 800 books, pamphlets, memoranda and documents dealing with various aspects of the 1905-1907 revolutionary movement were published, along with more than 650 newspaper articles.

The collection also examines works which present an analysis of the behavior of various classes and political parties in the 1905-1907 period. The authors emphasize that Lenin is rightly credited for his contribution to the world liberation movement in discovering new laws governing the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat during the era of imperialism, the importance of a proletarian party of the new type, and the role of the proletariat as dominant not only in a socialist revolution but also in bourgeois-democratic revolutions. At the same time, the study of Lenin's abundant legacy of ideas convinces us 100 times over that all his assessments of the class and political nature of bourgeois democracy are infused with profound historicism, deriving from a thorough study of the behavior of individual strata of the bourgeoisie at various stages of the revolution.

The experience of the bolshevik party's struggle in the 1905-1907 period is of enduring significance in our days. CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Comrade L. I. Brezhnev has remarked in this connection that "Lenin's teachings about the hegemony of the proletariat in a bourgeois-democratic revolution, the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, relations to other classes and parties, and the proletarian party's tactics during times of the rise and decline of revolution--all these continue to constitute a bolshevik 'model of tactics for all' who are called upon to overthrow an exploitative system."

The book focuses much attention on analyzing contemporary historiography of the military-combat activities of the party of the bolsheviks. Soviet researchers and scientific institutions have done a great deal in this field. During preparations for the celebration of the 50th anniversary of the first Russian revolution, and in subsequent years, more than 100 collections of documents were published, which substantially expanded our source holdings. As for problems which have been less adequately studied, the book notes that they include the question of the bolshevik party's organization of the armed struggle of the peasantry and the mutual aid of the workers and peasants during the period of armed uprising. Also needing more detailed study are such questions as the party's struggle for the masses of soldiers and sailors, the influence of the class battles of the proletariat and the peasantry on the revolutionary movement in the army, the training of cadres for leadership in military-combat work, and a number of others.

The reader will find abundant material and interesting ideas and observations in this collection. It is also important to note that in elucidating current problems of Soviet historiography the authors have also raised a number of questions which require further study.

Not all the materials making up the collection are of equal value, and there is a certain unevenness in the manner and style of exposition. Nevertheless, the book's well-thought-out thematic orientation, profound analyticity, and good argumentation make it on the whole interesting, essential, and useful.

Review by Doctor of Historical Sciences V. Lavrin of "Sovetskaya Istoriofografiya Fevral'skoy Burzhuaizno-Demokraticeskoy Revolyutsii. (Leninskaya Kontseptsiya Istorii Fevralya i Kritika yeye Fal'sifikatorov)" [Soviet Historiography of the February Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution. (Lenin's Conception of the History of February and a Critique of Its Falsifiers)], Nauka, Moscow, 1979, 318 pp.

The work under review, compiled by a collective of authors of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of History of the USSR, has drawn the attention of many readers. It analyzes and systematizes the basic literature dealing with the problem, especially covering the preceding 20 years. During that period a number of fundamental works appeared on the history of the February revolution, along with a series of historiographical works summarizing the findings of research in connection with the 50th and 60th anniversaries of Great October.

For the first time in historiography there appeared an integrated scientific work tracing the basic lines in the process of accumulation of our knowledge about the February revolution, examining unresolved problems, and mapping out ways to explore them further. It systematically elucidates the problems of the second bourgeois-democratic revolution in the works of V. I. Lenin and the findings of Soviet historians' research into the role of the classes and political parties in it, also presenting a critique of the bourgeois and petit bourgeois historiography of this revolution. The comprehensiveness of the exploration of this theme is one of the book's strong points.

The work reveals Lenin's conception of the February Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution, which stands forth in the dynamics of historical development. The work also emphasizes the idea of the profound internal unity of Lenin's numerous studies on February, showing that "Lenin's historical conception of the February revolution is a component of the Marxist-Leninist conception of world and national history, the history of the revolutionary movement" (p 44).

The development of Lenin's conception of February took place under conditions of fierce ideological struggle with bourgeois and petit bourgeois historiography, including its Trotskyist variety. The victory of Lenin's conception marks the triumph of scientific knowledge over all manner of bourgeois falsifications.

In connection with an assessment of the literature devoted to the activities of the party of the bolsheviks during World War I and in the period of the February revolution, the work continues an analysis of Lenin's theoretical and revolutionary-practical endeavors. At the same time, the authors believe that the theme "V. I. Lenin and the Second Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution in Russia" needs further special detailed investigation.

The book presents a multilevel analysis of the literature dealing with the struggle of the bolshevik party to prepare for and win the second bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia. The analysis centers on the struggle of Lenin's party to secure the hegemony of the proletariat in the revolutionary movement and its alliance with the peasantry (and during World War I to bring over to its side the masses of soldiers--that is, peasants dressed in soldiers' uniforms), to isolate the bourgeoisie from the masses, and to unmask the policies of the petit bourgeois parties promoting the spread and strengthening of bourgeois influences on the proletariat and the masses of working people. The prehistory and the history of the February revolution is a period of further closing of the ranks of the bolshevik party, strengthening its ideological and moral-political unity, preparing its members for the new historic stage in the struggle of the proletariat to gain power. The victory of the February revolution fully validated the correctness of Lenin's strategy and bolshevik tactics and created the conditions for successfully transforming the democratic revolution into a socialist one.

Nevertheless, the bolshevik party's activities in the February revolution, the book notes, "are not elucidated with equal depth and detail" in the works of Soviet historians (p 93). Further exploration is needed into problems of the party's ideological work among the masses, the struggle of the local party organizations, a number of important aspects of the activities of the Russian Social Democratic Workers Party Central Committee bureaus abroad and in Russia, the correlation of objective and subjective factors, randomness and deliberateness in the revolution, and so on.

The book presents a detailed analysis of the literature dealing with the history of the menshevik and socialist revolutionary parties, especially works published in the past 10 to 15 years. These works have substantially deepened the exploration of questions relating to the political activities of these parties, revealed the factors which after the victory of the February

revolution temporarily brought the mensheviks and the socialist revolutionaries to the surface of political life, and demonstrated the ephemeral nature of their successes and the historical inevitability of the political bankruptcy and disappearance of these parties.

The authors also present a historiographical analysis of works dealing with the history of the Russian bourgeois parties, especially the constitutional democrats. In assessing the cardinal political and theoretical aspects of the problem, they note, Soviet historians are all in agreement. They are united in their conclusions "about the inherent counterrevolutionary nature of the Russian bourgeoisie, the profound hostility of its policies toward the interests of the working masses, and the historical laws leading to its destruction" (p 172).

The book unmasks the menshevist, socialist revolutionary, and constitutional democratic historiography of the February revolution. The similarity of the theoretical positions of the petit bourgeois and the bourgeois historiography concerning the February revolution enabled foreign bourgeois historians, especially the "Sovietologists," to make extensive use of the conceptions of these parties--bankrupt, defeated, gone forever from the arena of history--in their treatment and assessment of the course and outcome of the February revolution in Russia. The "glorious," "lawful," "classless," "unanimous" February revolution--these claims, long since refuted by Soviet historical science, are stubbornly put forth in the Western historiography of the Great October Socialist Revolution to counter its world-historic accomplishments. The book's survey of contemporary bourgeois literature concerning the February revolution reveals only a slight "modernization" now taking place in bourgeois historiography, an attempt at a "balanced" point of view--more accurately, objectivistic camouflage serving the interests of capitalism as before.

In our opinion, the work should have dealt at greater length with the so far small literature concerning the origins of the revolutionary situation in Russia prior to the events of February. Let us note, incidentally, that problems of the two revolutionary situations in Russia in the second half of the 19th century have been explored in much greater detail in this country than those dealing with the revolutionary situations prior to the first and second bourgeois-democratic revolutions of the 20th century.

On the whole, the authors have made a major contribution to the historiography of the February revolution.

Review by Doctor of Historical Sciences N. Ruban of
"Sovetskaya Istoriografiya Velikoy Oktyabr'skoy
Sotsialisticheskoy Revolyutsii" [Soviet Historiography
of the Great October Socialist Revolution], Nauka, Moscow,
1981, 293 pp.

The collective of authors has analyzed the main works in the past 15 years dealing with the major event of the 20th century. An assessment of the vast literature published in that period is to be found in a number of major works

by Soviet historians, and individual aspects of it are explored in monographs and doctoral and candidates' dissertations. A major contribution to the historiography of Great October is made above all in such fundamental scientific works as the relevant volumes of "Istoriya Kommunisticheskoy Partii Sovetskogo Soyuza" [History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union] and "Istoriya SSSR s Drevneyshikh Vremen do Nashikh Dney" [History of the USSR from Earliest Times to Our Days].

The book under review here, in our opinion, is by no means a run-of-the-mill phenomenon in contemporary historiography. It is the first major monograph investigating this problem which is distinguished by scientific depth, great detail, and comprehensive analysis.

It opens with a chapter concerning October Leniniana. This section of historiography is of special scientific interest. Lenin's literary legacy is not only a solid methodological base but also an inexhaustible source of historical facts, including those dealing with the problems of the October Revolution. The completion of the publication of V. I. Lenin's complete collected works was of invaluable significance. And the source base of historical science has also been augmented by such important works as "Vladimir Il'ich Lenin. Biograficheskaya Khronika" [V. I. Lenin. Biographical Chronicle], "Vospominaniya o Vladimire Il'iche Lenine" [Recollections of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin] in five volumes, and the collection "Lenin v 1917 godu. Vospominaniya" [Lenin in 1917. Recollections], and others.

The 1960s and 1970s saw the publication of a number of major monographs, both collective and individual authors, concerning the theoretical and practical activities of Lenin during the period of preparations for the October Revolution and the waging of it. The authors successfully penetrated more deeply into the laboratory of Lenin's theoretical thinking and revealed more fully the various aspects of his tireless day-to-day activities as the head of the party and the leader and organizer of the masses.

One chapter in this book analyzes the literature concerning the vital problem of the social-economic and political preconditions of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Its significance and topicality are enhanced by the fact that the deliberately tendentious interpretation of the question of the preconditions of the October Revolution that are widespread in the bourgeois and revisionist literature was the starting point for all manner of falsified assertions concerning the nature and character of our revolution.

A prominent place in historiography is assigned to the study of the subjective preconditions of Great October, in particular problems of the rise and activities of the revolutionary Marxist party in Russia, Lenin's development of Marxism in the new historic era, the theory of the socialist revolution, and the strategy and tactics of the new type of proletarian party.

Vast material is to be found in the chapter "Classes and Parties in October 1917." It notes correctly that historiography has been enriched by a number of major studies concerning the bolshevik party's leadership and guidance efforts to rally the working class ideologically and organizationally, and to

implement Lenin's strategy and tactics. Special focus is placed on the party's struggle to secure the proletariat's vanguard role in the revolution. More and more attention is focused on problems of the party's ideological-political work on the eve of the October Revolution and the struggle for the massive organizations of working people.

Fundamental work has also been done on such a cardinal problem of the proletarian revolution as the alliance of the working class with the peasantry. Much more has been done to elucidate fully the bolshevik party's implementation of the second strategic slogan on the peasant issue. The collective monograph "Leninskoye Ucheniye o Soyuze Rabochego Klassa s Krest'yanstvom" [Lenin's Teachings Concerning the Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry] and a number of other works have presented a more extensive and profound elucidation of Lenin's assertion concerning the neutralization of the middle peasantry. Soviet analysts have criticized the erroneous assertions of some historians to the effect that the proletariat entered the struggle for the victory of the socialist revolution in alliance with all the peasantry. Such assertions led to the denial of the regrouping of class forces during the transition from the first stage of the revolution to the second, they led to the ignoral of the differences between the bourgeois-democratic and the socialist revolutions. A considerable number of studies deal with problems of the party's political work in the countryside, its struggle for the army (over 60 percent of which consisted of peasants), and various aspects of the peasant movement.

Of considerable interest are the sections dealing with the historiography of the petit bourgeois and bourgeois-landowner parties. A distinguishing feature of these sections is their fuller and deeper utilization of Lenin's literary legacy. This has resulted in further serious steps in the study of the essence and causes of the political bankruptcy of the petit bourgeois and bourgeois-landowner parties.

Of vital importance is the study of the history of the revolutionary movement in the army. Historians are turning to such relatively little-studied and at the same time fundamentally important aims as the democratization of the army and its role in consolidating the victory of the February Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution and in accomplishing the Great October Socialist Revolution; the revolutionization of troops on the front and in the rear, the formation of soviets and committees in the army, their activities, and the process of their bolshevization; and the revolutionary transformations in the army after the triumph of October.

A vast and multifaceted historical and historiographical literature has been compiled concerning the socialist revolution in the national regions, and a vast wealth of new archival documents has been found and put into scholarly circulation. A great deal of factual material has been accumulated to serve as the basis for preparing new generalizing works. Special attention is drawn to works which explore the role played by Lenin and the communist party in the historic destinies of peoples, and the general laws and characteristics of the revolutionary process in different regions are elucidated.

A substantial contribution to the historiography of October is made by monograph works devoted to investigating the first social-economic transformations. Here again the key factor is Lenin's activities as the theoretician and organizer of socialist construction, the leadership and guidance role played by the communist party, and the economic-organizational efforts of the Soviet state.

Fundamental new works have been compiled on the history of agrarian transformations, including the initial period of socialist construction. The geographical framework of these studies has been substantially expanded. In essence there is not a single major region of the country that has been ignored by agrarian historians, who have elucidated both the general and the particular aspects of the transformations. A number of works deal with the confiscation of the landowners' holdings and the distribution of them within the boundaries of individual guberniyas and rayons of the country. Data concerning the time spans in which the first kolkhozes and sovkhozes came into being are pinpointed.

Of considerable interest is the section concerning the initial stage of the cultural revolution. Special, detailed emphasis is placed on questions regarding the development of public education, criticism of Proletarian Culture, and enlistment of the old intelligentsia to collaborate with the Soviet authorities. On this latter question alone about 2,000 works were written between 1967 and 1977.

Soviet historical science has done a great deal to elucidate the world-historic significance of our revolution, a task which has been considerably facilitated by increasingly stronger creative ties between Soviet scientists and foreign historians. A large number of works have been published on questions of developing Lenin's theory of revolution under contemporary conditions.

The book devotes a special chapter to a critique of the foreign bourgeois historiography of the October Revolution.

The authors single out certain problems that have been inadequately studied and comment on tasks yet to be resolved by historians. The book is interesting to read and, undoubtedly, constitutes a substantial addition to the historiography of Great October.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1982.

5003

CSO: 1802/3

END